

bility, that what we call our way of life has worked here, and can work wherever freedoms and responsibilities are kept balanced and controlled by a wise and informed citizenry and its leaders. The heritage of our country's past, in which peoples out of many races have made great contributions, is evidence of the capability of people to live together, work together, in understanding, and toward common goals that are positive and creative. It is fine, and certainly, I should think, in the best spirit of the Jewish and Christian faith, that we have such opportunities as this to meet together to give thanks to God for what has come down to us. Let us go away from this place with a new resolution in our hearts and minds—that we will be promoters of understanding, of cooperation, of continuing responsibility to the common and universal elements of our faiths that have brought us to this time.

ADDRESS BY EDGAR J. NATHAN, JR.

I am honored to have been invited to participate in this afternoon's celebration commemorating the 300th anniversary of the first Jewish settlement in this country. It is a beautiful tribute to our American way of life wherein all faiths join in perpetuating America's religious ideals.

It is indeed fitting that St. Mark's Church In-the-Bouwerie is the sponsor and host today, and it is particularly appropriate that the ceremonies are being held in its church for two very special reasons. In the first place, as you have heard, there lies buried here Peter Stuyvesant, the governor of New Amsterdam in 1654. And in the second place (as many of you know) the Jews and other neighbors helped repair and rebuilt the four-faced clock in the belfry of this church as did the Jews and other neighbors of Trinity Church in the early 16th or 17th century help reconstruct the steeple on that church, then as now on Broadway at Wall Street.

I am delighted at this opportunity to talk about some things our ancestors, and our contemporaries, have done—things that give evidence of a very precious freedom, the freedom to participate in the life of our country.

Coupled with this is another precious right—the right to be different from our neighbors, and their right to be different from us.

These are freedoms that make our Nation great, that enable a Jew to be both an American and a Jew, a Protestant to be an American and a Protestant and a Catholic to be an American and a Catholic. That makes it possible for American culture to benefit from the peculiarly individual contributions of the various groups of people that make up America.

In his letter to the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, R. I., George Washington summarized this significant greatness of America when he wrote in August 1790:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy; a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that tolerance is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection, should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Here, George Washington summed up for all time the essence of American freedom; the ideal for which all of us—Jews and non-Jews—have striven and are striving. These are the self-evident truths of man's equality under democratic government, which guarantees his "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These are the things the first Jewish settlers sought to gain when they came here in September 1654 and faced the despotic Gov. Peter Stuyvesant. These are the things summed up in the theme of the American-Jewish Tercentenary: "Man's Opportunities and Responsibilities Under Freedom."

The American Jewish tercentenary just concluding its year-long celebration will, it is hoped, inform every one of us in America, and possibly throughout the world, what history has recorded; that the freedoms we all cherish and enjoy in America came into being through the cooperation of all faiths. History establishes that it was not only one man, or one group, or one religion, that brought this about. It was accomplished by the religious groups of all faiths, and it was the spiritual values that stem from religion which gave the lifeblood to the determined fight which resulted in the establishment of the freedoms we now enjoy.

The history of these 300 years has certainly taught us the values of these freedoms. It has shown us that, by the exercise of understanding between people, they can achieve their ideals, their goals, and that war is not necessary. There have been wars before and during these 300 years, but they have been futile wars, all except our own war for independence. Going backward, the Second World War has not yet resulted in peace, indeed, if it is yet ended. The First World War led to the Second World War. Battles were won, but the goals for which the wars

were fought were not achieved. The only times when there has been spiritual progress and peace in the world has been when there has been understanding among the people. An instance—perhaps the most significant one to us, at least—that is proof of this, is the birth of the United States. It was made possible, in the first instance, by the 23 Jews who landed here in 1654, who, with others, fought for their human rights and won them, not only for themselves but, in the words of Peter Stuyvesant, for the "Lutherans and Papists," as well. It was one of the great landmarks in the ancient Dutch tradition of religious freedom and human decency when, just 300 years ago last month, the Dutch West India Co., overruling the edict of Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, granted these first Jewish settlers permission to remain in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam. By the time of the Revolution, 100 years or so later, these freedoms were firmly entrenched on American soil. The war was fought to preserve them and to establish what became the United States of America. That war was won; its goals were achieved; and the ideals, the preservation of which made that war necessary, were maintained and have survived unto this day. It is for us to keep them strong.

Last October, at the American Jewish national tercentenary opening dinner in this city, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said: "We have come together in memory of an inspiring moment in history—that moment, 300 years ago, when a small band of Jewish people arrived. * * * It was an event meaningful not only to the Jews of America but to all Americans—of all faiths, of all national origins."

He continued: "On that day there came to these shores 23 people whose distant ancestors had, through the Old Testament, given new dimensions of meaning to the concept of freedom and justice, mercy and righteousness, kindness and understanding—ideas and ideals which were to flower on this continent. They were of a people who had done much to give to Western civilization the principle of human dignity; they came to a land which would flourish—beyond all 17th century dreams—because it fostered that dignity among its citizens. Of all religious concepts," said the President of the United States, "this belief in the infinite worth of the individual is beyond doubt among the most important. On this faith our forefathers constructed the framework of our Republic."

Let us seriously ponder and long remember the words of this great leader. They may contain the key to the future for many of us in this land.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 25, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. C. Stanley Lowell, minister, Virginia Beach Methodist Church, Virginia Beach, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who guidest the stars in their courses, who considerest the fate of the nations, and who carest for all the sons of men—even unto the last and the least—we rejoice in another day to serve. What we have done and been Thou knowest. What is in us to achieve Thou knowest. Help us to repent of our

wrongs, to learn from our mistakes, and to hold fast to that which is good.

We pray for the Members of this body, humbly thankful for their service to their country and to mankind. Bring to their deliberations and decisions the wisdom that is from above. Equip their power with restraint and their knowledge with humility. Teach them when to shift and accommodate and when to stand fast. Imbue their realism with idealism and their idealism with realism. Let there be that nice balance between the things that ought to be done and the things that can be done, so that the two may be constantly merged in helpful action.

As we pray for them, we pray for the Nation they represent—a nation bearing awful responsibilities in a frightening time. Bestow upon its citizens the boon of self-discipline. Grant them such integration of character that, seeing the

right, and knowing the right, they may do the right. May virtue be the undergirding of their power. Let their strength be as the strength of ten because their hearts are pure. We pray through Him whom men call Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 26, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.
(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; and
H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; and
H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S HUMAN RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 149)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the development of agriculture's human resources, which was referred to

the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of April 27, 1955, p. 5149, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 28, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the routine morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to state, for the information of the Senate, that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 14, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services.

At the conclusion of the morning hour the Senate will consider that bill; and I expect action on that measure to be followed by the consideration of Calendar No. 223, a bill (S. 148) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa; Calendar No. 224, a bill (S. 653) to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, Louisiana, to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 225, a bill (S. 933) to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 226, a bill (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; Calendar No. 228, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36,759-acre tract to the Vineyard School District of the County of Kern, State of California; Calendar No. 229, a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; Calendar No. 231, a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week; and Calendar No. 232, a bill (S. 1271) to authorize the the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

I might say that at the last session I discussed these bills and resolutions with the distinguished minority leader, and he agreed to their consideration. I have

asked the aides of the Senate to inform interested committee chairmen and Senators that the bills and resolutions will be taken up.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON VIOLATIONS OF OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 26 reports on overobligations of appropriations received from the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, covering its activities as of December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPEAL OF SECTION 1157, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract, within Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SAMUEL E. ARROYO

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 17"

"Joint resolution relative to the inclusion of United States Highway 101 (from Los Angeles to the Oregon State line) and United States Highway 199 (from Crescent City to the Oregon State line) in the national system of interstate highways

"Whereas United States Highway 101, which traverses the State of California from the international boundary line near Tia Juana to the Oregon State line via Los Angeles, San Francisco, Eureka, and Crescent City, is one of the most important highways in this State, carrying as it does a tremendous volume of international, interstate, and local vehicular traffic; and

"Whereas United States Highway 199, which joins United States Highway 101 at Crescent City in this State and traverses the inland area of the State of Oregon by way of Grants Pass, is also an interstate artery of major importance, carrying heavy traffic of all types; and

"Whereas United States Highways 101 and 199, which are included in the Federal primary highway system, are essential links in the interstate and international highway system of the Nation; and

"Whereas in the event of atomic attack or any other national defense emergency on the west coast, United States Highway 101 would assume even greater importance as an avenue for necessary evacuation of inhabitants of urban areas and transportation of civil-defense equipment and personnel; and

"Whereas the only form of ground transportation between Grants Pass and Crescent City is via United States Highway 199 and between Crescent City and Eureka is via United States Highway 101 (both being sections of State Highway Route 1), there being no railroad facilities between these points; and

"Whereas under section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, provision was made for the selection of a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent, so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas additional allocations of Federal-aid highway funds are made by Congress for expenditure on this national system of interstate highways, as evidenced by the additional allocation of \$175 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and \$175 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, made by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 for this purpose; and

"Whereas the Congress is now in the process of enacting legislation which would supply hundreds of millions of additional funds for the national system of interstate highways; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has recommended 'that the Federal Government assume primary responsibility for the cost of a modern interstate network to be completed by 1964 to include the most essential urban arterial connections at an annual average cost of \$2.5 billion' for the next 10 years; and

"Whereas while the portion of United States Highway 101 in this State from the Mexican border to the city of Los Angeles was included in this national system of in-

terstate highways, the remainder thereof from Los Angeles to the Oregon boundary was left out of said system, as was United States Highway 199, and neither are at the present time included therein; and

"Whereas it is felt by the people of the State of California that it is imperative for the sake of interstate and international vehicular traffic and national defense, that all of United States Highway 101 in this State, and also all of United States Highway 199, be included in the national system of interstate highways and thereby be eligible for the additional Federal-aid highway funds expended on such highways in order to bring portions of said highways up to the standards necessary to adequately handle the volume of traffic now in existence on said highways and the certain increase thereof due to the continuing growth in the population of this State and to cope with the increased burdens which will be placed on said highways in case of a national defense emergency; and

"Whereas the County Supervisors Association of California, at its annual convention in Los Angeles last September 1954, adopted a resolution urging the inclusion of United States Highways 101 and 199 in the national system of interstate highways, indicating statewide support: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, the California Highway Commission, and the State department of public works to take whatever steps are necessary to include the highways described in this resolution in the national system of interstate highways; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Commerce and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, to the chairman and members of the California Highway Commission and the director of public works, to the County Supervisors Association of California, and to the supervisors unit of the Redwood Empire Association; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Oregon State Senate, to the speaker of the Oregon State House of Representatives, and to the chairman and members of the Oregon State Highway Commission, with letters of transmittal expressing the friendly greetings of the California State Legislature and the hope that the Oregon State Legislature, now in session, will take similar action calling for inclusion of sections of United States Highways 199 and 101 within the State of Oregon in the national system of interstate highways and also that the agencies concerned in the States of Oregon and California may work co-operatively together for the accomplishment of common objective, in the public interest nationally."

A current resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island, to be used as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics

"Whereas the Federal Government has recently abandoned the use of the lands, prop-

erties, and facilities located at Ellis Island in the harbor of the city of New York which it has operated for many years as a center for the reception, care, custody, and processing of persons immigrating into this country; and

"Whereas the said lands, properties, and facilities are no longer being operated or maintained by the Federal Government for any purpose whatsoever, and unless properly and continuously maintained they will inevitably deteriorate through nonuse and will ultimately become obsolete, uninhabitable, and valueless for any purpose; and

"Whereas the State of New York and the city of New York are in dire need of additional facilities for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, as manifested by the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives in the legislature, that the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island are ideally suitable for and can be readily converted into a well-equipped clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, to be operated and maintained by the State or the city of New York, or jointly by both the State and the city of New York: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and/or the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island, formerly used by the Federal Government as a reception center for immigrants, for use by the State and/or the city of New York as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York, and that they be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk."

"In senate, April 1, 1955, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate.

"WILLIAM S. KING,

"Secretary."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint Resolution 6"

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate moneys for marketing reporting and crop-estimating work in Hawaii

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has appropriated funds to the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture for the maintenance of crop estimating and market reporting service in most mainland agricultural areas; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii now maintains crop estimating and market reporting services solely through the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of Hawaii;

"Whereas crop estimates and market reports are an indispensable aid to farmers, dealers, military, and governmental consumers, and the general public; and

"Whereas the production information covers commodities having an annual wholesale

value of approximately \$40 million and the market information covers approximately \$50 million; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America, paying its full share of Federal taxes and is being denied equal treatment with the States; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii because of its geographical position is in greater need than most of the States of having complete and accurate information on prospective crop harvests and market conditions: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and urged to include in the current budget of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture an appropriation of \$16,000 to the market reporting division and \$25,000 to the agricultural estimating division thereof to be expended in Hawaii for crop estimates and market reports in cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of Hawaii.

"Sec. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 22d day of April A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 59

"Concurrent resolution requesting the President and the Congress of the United States to consider favorably the proposed revision of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946

"Whereas a spirit of good will and amity exists between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America, and the Republic of the Philippines stands as a trusted friend of the United States in the Pacific and the Far East; and

"Whereas the young Republic of the Philippines is valiantly and conscientiously attempting to achieve economic self-sufficiency and stability and a sound governmental budget through the development of its natural resources, industrial plants, and commercial enterprises; and

"Whereas part of this economic development will be dependent upon the ability of the Philippine Republic to import the industrial machinery, equipment, and tools necessary to this development, and such importation requires a favorable balance of trade with other nations, particularly the United States; and

"Whereas United States Government expenditures in the Philippines have declined from an average annual figure of \$345 million during 1946 to 1950 to a sum slightly over \$140 million in the years 1951 to 1953, and the duties foregone by the Philippine Republic on United States imports were three times those foregone by the United States on Philippine imports from 1946 to 1954 under the Philippine Trade Act of 1946; and

"Whereas the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (Bell Trade Act) is now undergoing revision in the Congress of the United States and such a trade agreement is of vital importance to the United States and the Republic of the Philippines: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United

States are hereby respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to the following provisions of the proposed revision to the Philippine Trade Act of 1946: The acceleration of duties on imports to the Philippines from the United States and the deceleration of duties on imports to the United States from the Philippines; the removal of certain commodities from absolute quotas with proper and judicious safeguards; a 12-month restrictive quota or quotas on certain commodities as necessary by both countries to safeguard their domestic production; the mutual protection from discriminatory export taxation by either country; the deletion of currency and exchange provisions and the inclusion of 'treaty merchant status' provisions applicable to aliens of the two countries; the mutualization of rights of the citizens of one country engaged in business in the other and the reciprocity of non-discrimination; and the requirement that neither country be compelled to furnish any information contrary to its national security; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, President of the Philippines, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the convention of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., at Eau Claire, Wis., relating to unfair import competition under the present Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by Marian Council, No. 3852, Knights of Columbus, Cutchogue, and Rev. James V. Rogan Council, No. 1816, Knights of Columbus, Central Islip, both of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., protesting against the enactment of legislation to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Los Angeles District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, at Santa Monica, Calif., relating to wages paid in the Forest Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 20

"Whereas the United States Supreme Court in an opinion written in the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc. v. Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) has held that a contractor with Federal agency can be constituted a Federal purchasing agent in the absence of a Federal act prohibiting this, and thereby the contractor's purchases and use of tangible personal property are immunized from State taxation; and

"Whereas under the rule established by this opinion practically any activity engaged in by a private contractor on behalf of a Federal agency can be immunized from any State taxation by appropriate contract phraseology, resulting in serious interference with State and local powers of taxation contrary to the established policy of Congress and the expressed will of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas no additional rights of taxation are sought on behalf of the States, only the restoration and the preservation of these rights which existed prior to the pronouncement of the rule here complained of; and

"Whereas if there is to be any withdrawal from the sovereign States of the Union of

any portion of their power to tax Government contractors there should be an equal withdrawal from the Federal Government of its power to tax State employees and contractors, to the end that the power to tax shall remain in balance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 56th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the senate concurring), That the general assembly respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as possible legislation which will secure and make certain to the States of the Union and the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax upon any privilege exercised under the protection and authority of the law of any State of the Union, except such taxes the direct incidence of which would be upon the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to initiate action by the Army engineers for the development and improvement of harbor facilities in the town of Bristol

"Whereas the town of Bristol has always been a center of maritime activity; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the State of Rhode Island depends to a great extent upon ample harbor facilities, not only for the use of its thriving industry but also as a means of sending forth its manufactured products into the stream of interstate and foreign commerce; and

"Whereas the harbor of the town of Bristol is an important element in the potential commercial harbor facilities of the State; and

"Whereas said harbor of the town of Bristol would provide an excellent base of operation for shipping of all types if said harbor were to be properly dredged and improved: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to initiate action by the Army engineers for the dredging and improvement of the harbor at Bristol; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, duly certified copies of this resolution."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in behalf of a study of the Federal liquor tax policy and the enactment of legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate

"Whereas the 21st amendment to the Constitution of the United States vests in the individual States control over the trade in and use of alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas in the exercise of such control 46 States including the State of Rhode Island have recognized the compelling demand for alcoholic beverages, and have enacted laws to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the people by allowing only those who are morally responsible to engage in the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages, and by strictly supervising such production and distribution; and

"Whereas the aforesaid 46 States have levied excise taxes on alcoholic beverages for the purposes of encouraging temperance, reimbursing the States for their costs in

maintaining such strict supervision and control, and providing revenue; and in fixing the amount of these excises, States have sought an optimum figure which will achieve a balance between the three enumerated objectives; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has so substantially increased its excise tax on alcoholic beverages that the consumer price of such beverages has risen to several times their cost of production; and

"Whereas the result of such increase in consumer price has been to divert many sales from the controlled distribution system set up by the State of Rhode Island to the bootleg industry with an accompanying disregard for law, danger to the health of its citizens, and loss of revenue to both State and Federal Governments; and

"Whereas it is the considered judgment that the Federal Government has raised its excises beyond the optimum level consistent with the objectives of taxation and control; and has taken from the State of Rhode Island the power to restore the proper balance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, in order to eliminate bootlegging, restore respect for law and order, and provide adequate revenues for both State and Federal Governments, does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and enact legislation reducing the present excessively high tax rate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to transmit to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONROE):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 18

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and his Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture relative to transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States

"Whereas the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, a subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, has reportedly recommended to the Commission the transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States; and

"Whereas the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing more than 2,600 soil-conservation districts in the United States, and the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing 86 soil-conservation districts in this State, along with other individuals, groups, and organizations who are vitally interested in the program, are opposed to the reported recommendation; and

"Whereas if the reported recommendation is approved, it would place an inordinately heavy financial burden upon the State of Oklahoma, since the contemplated State appropriation each biennium would amount to a sum in excess of \$4 million in addition to sums now being appropriated if assistance to local soil-conservation districts is to be maintained at current levels; and

"Whereas such program would greatly retard, if not eventually destroy, the national program of soil and water conservation now being carried on, and since the problem is national in scope, it should be dealt with accordingly: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, relative to gradual transfer of soil conservation technical assistance functions, from the national authority to the various States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Oklahoma in the Nation's Capitol.

"Adopted by the senate the 6th day of April 1955.

*"PINK WILLIAMS,
President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 13th day of April 1955.

*"B. E. HARKEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to cause to be minted a half dollar commemorating the 50th anniversary of the State of Oklahoma

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America on June 16, 1906, enacted the Enabling Act providing the means whereby the people of Oklahoma Territory and Indian Territory did, on November 16, 1907, become the 46th State of the Union; and

"Whereas in the short period of 50 years, the State of Oklahoma has had an unprecedented growth and development in the fields of agriculture, oil, mining, and arts and sciences, and has furnished outstanding leadership both in civil and military endeavors; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oklahoma have a great heritage from their pioneer fathers and mothers who overnight established cities, towns, and government upon a raw and unsettled land; and

"Whereas Oklahoma now proudly stands as the most progressive State in the Union, and has in its short lifetime achieved miraculous accomplishments and is entitled to receive from the Government of the United States just recognition therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to take such action as will cause to be minted by the Government of the United States a half dollar of such design as will properly commemorate the State of Oklahoma upon its 50 years of progress, and that the same be dated 1957; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to each Member of the Oklahoma Delegation in Congress, the chairmen of the appropriate committees dealing with the matter before the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, and that a copy thereof be furnished to the Treasury Department and the Governor of the Federal Reserve System.

"Adopted by the senate the 23d day of February 1955.

*"PINK WILLIAMS,
President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 13th day of April 1955.

*"B. E. HARKEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 528

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States relating to legislation designed to limit imports of glass, lead, zinc, and oil

"To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"1. That imports of glass, lead, zinc, and oil have forced a curtailment of production of these products within the State of Oklahoma.

"2. That said curtailed production has caused material unemployment within the State of Oklahoma with great damage to the economy of our State because of losses in income to employees in the several industries mentioned.

"3. That the foreign products so imported are manufactured with substandard labor are of inferior quality, and, therefore, should not be permitted to compete with domestic products to the detriment of both labor and management in the industries mentioned.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, prays:

"That the President and Congress of the United States enact such legislation as will curtail the imports of glass, lead, zinc, and oil to the end that full-scale domestic production may be restored.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 24th day of March 1955.

*"B. E. HARKEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 559

"Resolution calling attention to drought-stricken areas of the State of Oklahoma and requesting aid through the Federal drought emergency feed program and urging that consideration be given by the Oklahoma representatives in Congress to legislation authorizing long-term low-interest-rate loans to drought-stricken farmers in Oklahoma

"Whereas extreme drought conditions throughout the State of Oklahoma, particularly in the northwestern and southwestern counties of the State, have caused the destruction of pastures and have so affected the economics of farmers in said areas that there is grave danger that valuable foundation herds may be sacrificed because of lack of feed; and

"Whereas the Federal drought emergency feed program administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, if authorized to do so, can greatly alleviate the situation in the counties affected by supplying much-needed feed, as provided in said program; and

"Whereas unseasonable drought conditions in Oklahoma for the past several years have been the cause of many farmers in Oklahoma becoming unable to meet their financial obligations and causing them to be in danger of losing their farms and their homes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That the United States Department of Agriculture be requested to allocate assistance to farmers in all counties in Oklahoma where same is needed under the provisions of the drought emergency feed program and that said assistance be made retroactive to April 1, 1955; be it further

"Resolved, That the 25th Oklahoma Legislature hereby expresses the view and strongly recommends that the Congress of the United

States give careful consideration to legislation which will authorize a complete re-financing program permitting drought-stricken farmers to secure long-term loans at low interest rates through the Farmers Home Administration, and that such agency be permitted to regulate the processing of such loan applications in such manner that immediate assistance may be granted to applicants in drought-stricken areas of the State; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Department of Agriculture and to each of the Members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation in Washington, D. C.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of April 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,

"Speaker, House of Representatives."

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF SOUTH MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today from Louis J. Mosakowski, city clerk of the city of South Milwaukee, the text of a resolution which had been adopted by the common council of that municipality in opposition to pending Federal legislation which would destroy Federal regulation of natural gas rates at the wellhead.

I heartily endorse this resolution and know that it represents the sentiments of the people of Wisconsin as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas certain legislation is pending before the Congress of the United States, including the so-called Harris bill which would amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and exempt from rate regulation of the Federal Power Commission those companies producing and supplying natural gas for sale in interstate commerce; and

Whereas it appears that passage of such legislation would result in increased gas rates to the consumers of South Milwaukee; and

Whereas it appears regulation of natural gas rates at the wellhead is required to protect the public because of limited competition and concentration of ownership in a few companies; and

Whereas the League of Wisconsin Municipalities and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers have already gone on record in opposition to such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee hereby records its opposition to any Federal legislation which would eliminate Federal regulation of natural gas rates at the wellhead, and calls upon Members of Congress to defeat any such legislation, including the Harris bill; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, to both Wisconsin Senators and all Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

Adopted April 6, 1955.

LOUIS J. MOSAKOWSKI,
City Clerk.

Approved April 7, 1955.

DEAN L. POTTER,
Mayor.

LETTER FROM WISCONSIN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear today from the director of the department of national affairs of the Wisconsin Optometric Association concerning two important matters of interest to its membership.

The first is the upholding of the Church-Wiley law against fireworks bootlegging. The second is an amendment to the bill introduced by my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], entitled the Medical Research Act of 1955—an extremely important bill to provide grants-in-aid to accredited nonprofit universities and schools of medicine, dentistry, to hospitals, laboratories and other nonprofit institutions engaging in research, and to defray the cost of construction of facilities for the battling of crippling and killing diseases.

I believe that Dr. Jacobson's letter will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for its favorable attention.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., April 26, 1955.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On behalf of the Wisconsin Optometric Association I wish to invite your attention to Public Law 385 and bill S. 849 and to express our concern in regard to them.

First, concerning Public Law 385 which provides for regulation of fireworks distribution on which you did such a highly commendable job last year, it has come to our attention that efforts are being made by new legislation (bill S. 1297) which would in effect provide for later repeal of Public Law 385. Although we are sure that you are well aware of this measure our association wishes to apprise you that we are vitally interested in upholding Public Law 385 for its unestimable benefits toward public safety and in particular the preservation of human vision. We hope and trust you will continue your efforts to maintain this law for all time to come.

Secondly, in reference to bill S. 849, to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases including blindness. The profession of optometry is interested in this legislation not only because the bill would provide funds for research facilities to aid in preventing blindness, but also because of the relationship between vision and the nervous disorders or mental illness. Optometry is rendering a vital service to the public and to improve and expand this service additional research facilities are most necessary. The bill as it now stands makes no specific mention of optometry, therefore, we feel that the bill should be amended to expressly include optometry in its provisions and also that one optometrist should be appointed to the council whose function it would be to recommend the allocation of funds for the various projects.

I have learned that although a Senate hearing has been held on S. 849 this month, it is still pending before the committee to meet in executive session to consider it. I

realize that you are not a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, however, any favorable consideration for our views which you may be able to bring to the attention of the members of this committee will be sincerely appreciated.

Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD M. JACOBSON, O. D.,
Director of Department of National
Affairs, Wisconsin Optometric
Association.

CLOSING OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OFFICE AT VIRGINIA, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by the City Council of Virginia, Minn., stating their opposition to the closing of the Internal Revenue Service office at Virginia, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 6202

Resolution by the city of Virginia, Minn., April 12, 1955, in opposition to the closing of the Virginia internal revenue office and the moving of same to Hibbing

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia, That—

Whereas the City Council of the City of Virginia has been informed that the local office of the internal revenue department is being closed forthwith and the personnel being transferred to the office in Hibbing, Minn.; and

Whereas the office in the city of Virginia has been maintained for 20 years or longer in office space made available to the revenue department by the city of Virginia without charge to the department; and

Whereas the development of the taconite industry has greatly increased the work of the Virginia office, and the transfer of personnel to Hibbing will make the cost of rendering service to the Virginia area and the newly developed taconite area increasingly expensive to the revenue department and increasingly burdensome to the public in securing the benefits of such service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Virginia for itself and for all of the citizens of the city of Virginia and in behalf of the people in the area served by the Virginia office place itself on record in opposition to the discontinuance of the Virginia office and the transfer of same to Hibbing and request that the revenue department reconsider its action and make available to Virginia and this area the service that it has had in the past 20 years. Further, that copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman Blatnik and Senators Humphrey and Thyne and to Mr. A. R. Knox, district director of internal revenue.

Adopted April 12, 1955.

Attest:

ARTHUR J. STOCK,
President of the City Council.
J. G. MILROY, Jr.,
City Clerk.

Approved April 18, 1955.

JOHN VUKELICH,
Mayor.

REORGANIZATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Wells Electric Association at a meeting on April 13, 1955, at Wells, Minn., stating their opposition to the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration as proposed by the Hoover Commission Task Force.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the task force on lending agencies of the Hoover Commission has recommended the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Wells Electric Association of Wells, Minn., is of the opinion that the proposed reorganization is not in the best interest of the Rural Electric Cooperatives, or of the farmers of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Wells Electric Association is opposed to the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration as proposed by the Hoover Commission Task Force, and that each of the United States Senators and Congressmen in whose district the Wells Electric Association operates be instructed to vote against any such reorganization.

Dated at Wells, Minn., this 13th day of April 1955.

WELLS ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
OTTO FAHNING, *President*,
GEORGE LORENZ, *Vice President*,
DALLAS YORKY, *Secretary-Treasurer*.
WILLARD MILLER, *Director*,
BEN REDMAN, *Director*.

EXPANSION OF CANE AND BEET SUGAR ALLOCATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted at a special meeting of the board of directors of the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce on March 28, 1955, at Moorhead, Minn., supporting the appeal of our sugar-beet producers for expanded allocation.

I have received similar resolutions from the following organizations: Commercial Club at Frost, Minn.; Hallock Lions Club, Hallock, Minn.; Kennedy Chamber of Commerce, Kennedy, Minn.; Chamber of Commerce, Blue Earth, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended in 1951 expires December 31, 1956; and

Whereas the sugar industry of the United States is today operating at a minimum of capacity; and

Whereas the annual consumption increase since 1947 has been 1 million tons; and

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital portion of the economy of the Red River Valley of the North; and

Whereas we do have at the present time capacities to produce and process more than double the amount of beet sugar being produced and marketed from this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Moorhead, Minn., go on record requesting that any increase in the consumption of sugar within the United States be given to the beet and cane producers within the terri-

torial boundaries of this country commensurate with their ability to produce and market this additional consumption economically and in the best interest of the sugar industry of the United States, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to all other interested parties.

PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners for Hennepin County, Minn., on April 12, 1955, relative to the plight of the American Indian and requesting that steps be taken to correct the situation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the deplorable condition of the American Indian has again been brought before the citizens of Minnesota and this county board; and

Whereas the well-meant efforts of a board member to solve the problem by giving a job to an unemployed Indian can only be a temporary solution to a single case, while there are thousands existing in America; and

Whereas the white settlers of a previous century seized from the original owners, by force and superiority of weapons, land, minerals, timber, and power sources of untold value; and

Whereas our attitude toward conquered peoples has changed, and instead of appropriating the wealth of the conquered we rebuild the bombed homes and public buildings, rehabilitate the sick and wounded, and restore the shattered economy of the conquered nation; and

Whereas our debt to the former owners of this broad land is greater than to the Nazis, the Japanese, and others conquered in recent wars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to alleviate current suffering among the Indians and to appoint a commission for a thorough study of the Indian problem to the end that all may be trained to become employable and self-supporting, and that attention to the problem of the original Americans be given priority to the subject of displaced persons from foreign lands. Integrating the Indian into our economic life will do much to erase from our history one of its blackest pages.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution passed by the Minnesota Holstein Breeders' Association of Stillwater, Minn., stating their endorsement of the amendment to the Selective Service Act, relating to the drafting of young men between the ages of 18 and 23.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Selective Service is in many cases drafting young men between the ages of 25 and 28, who often have established

farming operations or other occupations, and family life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we endorse the amendment to the Selective Service Act, as proposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation, which recommends the drafting of young men between the ages of 18 and 23, an age which would be far more desirable for the draftees.

THE SO-CALLED BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the delegates at a meeting of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware on Friday, April 22, 1955, reaffirming their support of the Bricker amendment.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are the highest peak of human accomplishment in mankind's struggle for freedom; and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements may override the Constitution and cut across the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights; and

Whereas unlimited treaty power poses a continuing threat to the Constitution, this threat having been recently augmented by the fact that four Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States actually held that the United Nations Charter—ratified treaty—supersedes our Constitution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware division of the Polish-American Congress, in plenary meeting assembled, reaffirm its previous support of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) and petition the State of Delaware Representatives in the United States Congress to support the adoption of this legislation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to State of Delaware Representatives in the United States Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 300. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Frypan-Arkansas project, Colorado; with amendments (Rept. No. 233).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 265. A bill to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the non-mineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; with amendments (Rept. No. 251).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 52. A bill to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Cocino National Forest, Arizona (Rept. No. 249); and

S. 53. A bill to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a

portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States (Rept. No. 250).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 732. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 246);

S. 748. A bill to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired; without amendment (Rept. No. 247); and

S. 1529. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 248).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; with additional amendments (Rept. No. 234);

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 237);

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana; with an amendment (Rept. No. 235);

S. Res. 33. Resolution for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission; with additional amendments (Rept. No. 238);

S. Res. 92. Resolution providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights; with an amendment (Rept. No. 239); and

S. Res. 94. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 236).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 741. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision which would terminate authority to provide insurance under such title; with amendments (Rept. No. 244);

S. 743. A bill to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 245); and

H. R. 1816. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; without amendment (Rept. No. 258).

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 35. Resolution providing for a study of merchant-marine training and education in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 257).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 669. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 253); and

S. 727. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the

District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 254).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 184. A bill to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 391. A bill to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 654. A bill to extend the direct-loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 243);

S. 755. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va. (Rept. No. 242); and

S. 1645. A bill to permit certain holders of mortgage purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days (Rept. No. 241).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1507. A bill to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 252).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2581. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendments (Rept. No. 259).

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, House bill 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 232) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BYRD. I ask permission to file minority views on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and that the report and minority views be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Virginia submitting a report on the reciprocal trade bill?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator also filing minority views?

Mr. BYRD. I have asked permission to file minority views on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if the Senator can tell us when the hearings on the bill will be printed and available?

Mr. BYRD. They are printed now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They are printed and available now?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. A copy of the bill and the report and minority views will be sent to each Senator tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I inquire of the Senator if it will be agreeable to him to proceed to the consideration of the bill following the morning hour on Monday?

Mr. BYRD. That will be agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express the hope, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Virginia, that the Senate may remain in session until rather late in the evening—6:30, 7, or 7:30 o'clock—during the discussion of the bill, certainly until we reach the voting stage, so that we may perhaps complete consideration of the bill next week.

Mr. BYRD. That will be entirely satisfactory to me. I agree with the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have been able, while waiting for committees to report bills, to recess from Thursday until Monday, and frequently from Monday until Thursday. From now on committees will be reporting important measures, which the Senate must consider. I therefore hope that the Senate will take notice of this fact, and that Senators will adjust their engagements so that they may be present for a full week, and prepared to remain in attendance until the early part of each evening while the Senate is in session.

ELIMINATION OF CUMULATIVE VOTING OF SHARES OF STOCK IN ELECTION OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 256) to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association, and I submit a report (No. 240) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the minority views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be printed as a part of the report of the majority of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and the report, including the minority views, will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the

Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1960, vice Nelson Lee Smith, term expiring June 22, 1955; and

Richard Newton Abrahams, and sundry other cadets, to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Forty-five postmasters.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably 1,560 nominations for appointment in the Navy. This group includes appointments as ensigns in the Navy and second lieutenants in the Marine Corps of this year's Naval Academy graduates, as well as a group of NROTC and Reserve appointments in the Navy and Marine Corps.

In addition to the above, I report the names of 326 Military Academy cadets for appointment in the Regular Army as second lieutenants and a group of 135 names of distinguished military students for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Army.

Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1836. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MURRAY):
S. 1837. A bill to amend section 15 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the

distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1838. A bill for the relief of Tomasso Scotto DiPerta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1839. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of an interstate compact providing for a toll road connecting the east and west coasts of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1840. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of dentists under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; and

S. 1841. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of lawyers under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

S. 1842. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1843. A bill for the relief of Efstathios Aristidou Spathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1844. A bill amending paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a) by including the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1845. A bill to provide for the discharge of tax liens on certain real property deeded to the United States of America subject to unpaid taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang; and

S. 1847. A bill for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1849. A bill to provide for the grant of career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1850. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Kamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1851. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to Mary Ann Aust; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1852. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1853. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1854. A bill to permit amounts paid motor-carrier transportation systems as compensation for the possession or control of such systems by the United States to be attributed, for income tax purposes, to the period of such possession or control; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 1855. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1856. A bill for the relief of Alina Kosmider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NEGOTIATION OF INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR A TOLL ROAD CONNECTING THE EAST AND WEST COASTS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of an interstate compact providing a toll road connecting at a point on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, east of Pittsburgh, and extending westward, following the general course of the National Pike, known as U. S. Route 40, to San Francisco.

I hope the Members of Congress will give this subject careful consideration.

A road of this character would connect the Atlantic seaboard with the Pacific slope. It would tie America together industrially, culturally, and spiritually. It could be used in case of necessity as a great military highway. Rights-of-way wide enough should be secured to take care of future needs of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1839) granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of an interstate compact providing for a toll road connecting the east and west coasts of the United States, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, California, and any other State or States, to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for the construction and operation of a toll road connecting the Pennsylvania Turnpike with the west coast of the United States, beginning at a point east of Pittsburgh, and extending westward, south of Pittsburgh, following the general course of the National Pike known as U. S. Route 40 to San Francisco. Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of all of the States entering into it and approved by the Congress of the United States.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE TO DENTISTS AND LAWYERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference,

two bills designed to extend social-security coverage. The first provides for voluntary coverage for dentists under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, and the other provides for the voluntary coverage of lawyers under that system.

Members of the Senate will recall that during the 83d Congress at the time that we were considering revisions of the Social Security Act, I submitted an amendment to extend this coverage to members of the dental profession. I did so as a result of a poll which had been taken by the Minnesota dentists which demonstrated overwhelming support for that social-security extension. Since that time there has been added evidence demonstrating to my complete satisfaction that members of the dental profession in other States, whenever given an opportunity to do so, voted to be covered by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

In connection with this matter I have just had an opportunity to learn from a poll taken in the State of Iowa that 81 percent of the voting dentists are in favor of coverage under social-security coverage, with only 12.5 percent opposed to it.

I ask unanimous consent to have an item from the Cedar Rapids News of January 10, 1955, and a memorandum from the Altman-Gilbert Advertising Agency of Cedar Rapids dealing with this subject included in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids News of January 10, 1955]

STATE'S DENTISTS FAVOR ACCEPTING SOCIAL SECURITY

The majority of Iowa dentists do not agree with the American Dental Association's stand on the question of social-security coverage.

And they do not agree with the Iowa delegation's vote on the question at the association's last convention, results of a poll of Iowa dentists showed Monday.

The poll was taken by the Altman-Gilbert Advertising Agency of Cedar Rapids, on behalf of a group of 22 Cedar Rapids dentists and 1 living in Dubuque. Results were tabulated by McGladrey, Hansen, Dunn & Co., a Cedar Rapids accounting firm.

The result, announced Monday, showed 81 percent of the voting dentists in favor of coming under social-security coverage, while 12.5 percent were opposed.

Of nearly 1,700 dentists in Iowa, the advertising agency report showed, 995 were accounted for in the tabulation.

It said that every registered dentist in the State was given an opportunity to vote—including about 400 who do not belong to the Iowa State Dental Society. The group which sponsored the poll includes both members and nonmembers of the society.

Only votes signed by the dentists were tabulated, the ad agency said. The names were checked against the list of Iowa dentists, and duplicate votes were eliminated.

Of the 995 ballots returned, 806 favored inclusion of dentists in the social-security program, while 124 were opposed.

Another 10 favored giving individual dentists the option of accepting or rejecting social-security coverage, while 15 reported "no opinion," and 3 wanted more information before voting.

Thirty-seven ballots were not delivered—either because the dentist had died or be-

cause of change of address or wrong addresses.

A spokesman for the group of Cedar Rapids dentists said that at the national society's last convention the vote was 215 against social-security coverage and 167 for coverage. He said the vote gets closer each year.

The Iowa delegation, he said, voted 4 to 3 against giving dentists social-security coverage.

Dentists now are excluded from the social-security program, because of the dental society's stand.

—
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, January 7, 1955.

EIGHTY-ONE PERCENT OF IOWA DENTISTS FAVOR SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THEMSELVES—12.5 PERCENT ARE OPPOSED TO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THEMSELVES

This information was gained from the figures tabulated by McGladrey, Hansen, Dunn & Co., certified public accountants in Cedar Rapids.

Following are final results of figures they tabulated from returns received by us on the recent poll we conducted at the request of, and financed by, 22 Cedar Rapids and 1 Dubuque dentists.

Nine hundred and ninety-five answers, signed by dentists, were turned over to the certified public accountants named above.

Dentists in favor of social security, 806; 81 percent.

Dentists opposed to social security, 124; 12.5 percent.

Dentists in favor of optional coverage, 10; 1 percent.

Dentists with no opinion, 15; 1.5 percent.

Letters returned because dentist deceased, 11; 1.1 percent.

Dentists wanting more information, 3; 0.3 percent.

Letters returned because of change of address, wrong address, and reasons other than deceased, 26; 2.6 percent.

Every registered dentist in Iowa was given the opportunity to vote, including about 400 who do not belong to the dental society.

Only votes signed by the dentist were included in the tabulation. These were checked on arrival against the list of Iowa licensed dentists, and all duplicate votes eliminated.

The original tabulation by McGladrey, Hansen, Dunn & Co. is on file in our office for inspection by anyone interested.

ALTMAN-GILBERT ADVERTISING AGENCY,
M. A. GILBERT.

Mr. HUMPHREY. According to Dr. H. W. Stonebrook, president, Iowa State Dental Society, Eldora, Iowa, in a letter dated December 21, 1953, to Secretary Hobby of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department:

Iowa favors inclusion of self-employed dentists to the ranks of OASI. In fact, the Des Moines District Dental Society, which comprises about one-fifth of the total dental population of Iowa, favors inclusion by 97 percent.

I am also advised that Mr. Schenck, a member from Ohio, shared my conclusions as a result of interviews and conferences he has held with the dentists in his State. His conclusions are identical with the results of an Ohio dental poll which found on the basis of 1,685 returns that the dentists voted 8 to 5 to be included under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Dental societies all over the Nation have conducted polls in many States, results of which show favor of the adoption of social security by a ratio of 8 to 1. This includes polls relating to the States of Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Ore-

gon, which I brought to the attention of the Senate last year. The polls show, according to the February 1954 issue of Oral Hygiene, the following results:

	Yes	No
Massachusetts.....	1,164	51
Minnesota.....	927	325
Oregon.....	397	140

I recently heard of a referendum conducted among members of the Chicago Dental Society which demonstrated that approximately 81 percent of the dentists voted to be included.

I am convinced that our Nation's dentists are fully deserving of the opportunity to participate in the social-security program.

On the basis of information available to me, it is made clear that the members of the legal profession share the same attitude. This was dramatized a few weeks ago at the annual midwinter meeting of the American Bar Association in Chicago.

The recommendation of the association's board of governors, which was approved by the house of delegates, is as follows:

In view of the present sentiment of the members of the legal profession in favor of voluntary social-security coverage, the board of governors recommends to the house of delegates that the American Bar Association favor voluntary coverage under the Social Security Act for lawyers and such of the professional groups as desire to be included.

The action of the American Bar Association is thoroughly consistent with polls taken of lawyers in a great many States and in my judgment, on the basis of information given to me, carries out the wishes of the members of the legal profession.

It is my hope that Congress will act in favor of my proposals and thus allow lawyers and dentists to share in the benefits that other citizens enjoy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 1840. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of dentists under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; and

S. 1841. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of lawyers under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act.

GRANTING OF CAREER-CONDITIONAL AND CAREER APPOINTMENTS TO CERTAIN INDEFINITE EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a new appointment system was put into effect by the Civil Service Commission on January 23, 1955. The new system is designed to accomplish two primary objectives. First, to establish a stable yet flexible appointment system for the long range future and, secondly, to eliminate the emergency procedures established under the Whitten amendment. The system sets

up a new kind of civil-service appointment called career-conditional. This type of appointment will generally be given to persons appointed from registers of eligibles set up through open competitive examinations. The first year of service is a probationary period which is considered an integral part of the examination. After completion of probation, the employee acquires competitive status. After 3 years the employee acquires a full career status.

When the new system went into effect some 220,000 indefinite employees, who entered the Government service on a competitive basis and who had 3 years or more of service, were converted to career status employees. An additional 235,000 indefinites, who also entered the Government service on a competitive basis, but who had less than 3 years' service, were converted to career-conditional. These employees will acquire full career status as soon as they complete the necessary 3 years of service.

Mr. President, the objectives of the new system are splendid and it is a fine thing from the standpoint of both the Government and the 455,000 indefinite employees who were converted to career or career-conditional that the system was adopted. However, there is a large group of indefinite employees who were not so converted and who should be, in my opinion. The group consists of employees who competed successfully in regular competitive civil-service examinations but were not appointed from a register of eligibles because they were already in the Federal service under some other type of appointment. I do not believe they should be barred from conversion to career or career-conditional status because of a technicality. Following are typical examples of the situation to which I refer:

(a) Eligible A was certified for the position of O. and M. examiner, grade 11. Upon reporting for interview he was advised the job was filled. However, he was offered, and accepted, a position as statistician, GS-11, outside the register. Within a few months he was reassigned to the O. and M. examiner position for which he was originally certified.

(b) A stenographer working in agency A under an appointment outside the register was offered appointment in agency B as a result of her certification from a stenographer register. She was persuaded by agency A to stay with them.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the grant of career conditional and career appointments in the competitive Civil Service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1849) to provide for the grant of career conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1852) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

The bill which I am introducing, and in which I am being joined by Senators MONRONEY, HUMPHREY, and SPARKMAN, would, if enacted, require the Eisenhower administration to restore the Federal Crop Insurance program to its original purposes. The original purpose of the crop-insurance program was to establish a means by which farmers and the American people could prepare themselves ahead of time to cushion the disastrous shocks of reduced farm income in local areas that always results when flood, drought, insect infestation, or disease strikes a debilitating blow to the farm production.

The American people have never been known to sit idly by to allow human suffering when disaster strikes their fellow citizens anywhere. We have always been generous of our work and our treasure to help rescue those who suffer from national disasters. The Federal Crop Insurance program was set up to make prior provision for such catastrophes on individual farms, in local areas, and in regionwide disasters. It was never intended that crop insurance would be a money-making proposition nor a Federal subsidy, rather it was intended that the American people would insure themselves against heavy future relief loans by paying the administrative costs of a crop-insurance program wherein the payments of indemnities for loss would be paid by farmers in premiums.

Under Secretary of Agriculture Benson, the Department of Agriculture has begun to erode this original purpose, adding purely administrative costs to the premiums charged to farmers. It has gone further and had bills introduced into the Senate (S. 1165) which would allow the charging of all administrative costs of the program to premiums. To do so would be to ask farmers to assume the entire risk of adverse weather and to shoulder the social costs of disaster always heretofore borne by the population at large.

The bill I am introducing (sec. 4) would prohibit the administration from loading up the premiums charged to farmers with administrative costs. This would return the program to its original purpose whereby farmers would assume the costs of the risk of crop failure and the people as a whole through their Government would pay the costs of administering the program.

When originally established, the current crop-insurance program was not applied nationwide to all crops, but only in a few counties to a few crops. The idea was that the program should be expanded gradually

as experience in its application was acquired. Now, however, we have seen the program jerked out of 9 drought-stricken counties with 7 more drought-stricken counties threatened. Moreover, we have heard that consideration is being given to eliminating crop insurance for durum wheat, which was stricken by rust and complete elimination of crop insurance for tobacco and other southeastern areas because the small size of the individual policies bring about a high ratio of administrative costs to premium income. This kind of action and reasoning is completely inconsistent with the purpose of the crop-insurance program. It is consistent only with the mistaken notion that the purpose of the Federal crop-insurance program is to do the experimental work required to turn a paying proposition over to private insurance companies in disregard of public and farmer needs for greater protection than can be insured by a profit-type insurance corporation.

The bill I am introducing would reverse this trend by requiring a 2-year notice of intention before an operating crop-insurance program could be jerked out of a county.

The Eisenhower administration has further revealed its intentions of turning the program over to private interests in two other ways: One, I understand that they have turned over a large part of their public actuarial records to be photostated by private-profit corporations for their own use. And two, the administration has in a dynamically progressive manner removed administration of crop-insurance program from the hand of democratically elected county and community committeemen and turned it over to the same private-profit insurance companies who have gotten the records and who have made some trial runs on skimming off the cream of the low-risk crop insurance business.

The bill I am introducing (sec. 1) would stop this kind of thing by requiring that the Secretary utilize the farmer committees in carrying out the crop-insurance program.

It was expected when we passed the 1947 crop insurance law, that the program would be expanded into additional counties and ultimately into all 3,000 farm counties. This expansion, while still provided by law, has made little progress recently. The bill I am introducing (sec. 2) does not put a mandate for rapid expansion. To do so might require unsound speed. My bill does require that if 200 farmers in a county petition for the program, the reasons for not so expanding the program must be incorporated in the next budget message of the President.

My bill has another provision that experience in the drought areas of the Southwest have shown to be needed (and this provision is not included in the administration bill, S. 1165). If a certain crop, for example, winter wheat should be adjudged a complete failure—the indemnity will be paid and the land immediately released so that it can be put into other soil holding land cover without cost of indemnity payment.

In a county where drought and destructive dust storms usually occur together, it is senseless to require land to lay bare as a requirement for collecting the crop insurance indemnity on a previous crop that has been a complete failure.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF PIPESTONE, MINN.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, and ask to have appropriately referred, amendments intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 210, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain property in the city of Pipestone, Minn., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INTERNAL SECURITY MANUAL (S. DOC. NO. 40)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 1, 1953, the Senate approved, at my request, a motion to print as a publication as Senate Document No. 47, 83d Congress, 1st session, a compilation of Federal statutes, Executive orders, and congressional resolutions relating to the internal security of our country.

Toward the end of the 83d Congress, a mass of important new legislation was enacted by the Congress in this field.

Since the start of this Congress, great numbers of messages of inquiry have come to me as to when a revision of the manual would be forthcoming, since it is now obsolete.

I ask unanimous consent for the revision of Senate Document No. 47 and for its publication as a new document in the 84th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to elaborate on the unanimous-consent request, and I ask unanimous consent that I be given 2 minutes in order to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, prior to Senate Document No. 47, there had never been available, in one place, all of the material, statutory and administrative, bearing upon the administration of internal security in our land.

Each day, however, congressional committees, executive agency personnel, newspaper editors, law-enforcement officers, security officers in industrial plants, union officials, attorneys, and a tremendous variety of other Americans have occasion to look up security data.

I am pleased to say that thousands of copies have been sold by the Government Printing Office at a cost of 70 cents apiece. The intelligence agencies of the United States Government, the security agencies, have secured hundreds of copies through my own office, the document rooms, and other congressional sources.

They have reported the manual as virtually indispensable to their work.

The manual was, of course, thoroughly proofread and checked prior to its issuance. It was reviewed by all the congressional investigations committees bearing upon the internal-security field, and by all the sources in the executive branch having responsibility for this problem.

The Library of Congress, which was responsible for the basic compilation, has now, in accordance with my instructions, compiled the necessary data for the revised edition.

Since there is, I understand, somewhat of a logjam at the GPO, in view of the wide number of other hearings and documents now being published, I feel that

the green light should be flashed for the publication of this revised document today, because it will obviously be some time before the revised document itself can be printed and available for distribution.

The manual has, I feel, reflected great credit on the Senate as an important guide, and I feel sure that the revised edition will be as well or even better received than was the original edition, which found great acceptance among all responsible observers.

ORDER TO RETURN CERTAIN PAPERS TO HIALMAR H. CARPER

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, Hialmar H. Carper recently submitted a written request to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia to return certain papers which were obtained from him by the Committee's Subcommittee on Crime and Law Enforcement in nineteen fifty-two. Yesterday an order, made in compliance with Mr. Carper's request, was approved by the Committee. I now present that order, and to the end that it may become operative, I ask unanimous consent that it be approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the order was read and agreed to, as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

It is ordered, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia be and is hereby authorized to return to Mr. Hialmar H. Carper, 4021 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va., the following documents which were produced by the said Hialmar H. Carper in 1952 to the Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia Investigating Crime and Law Enforcement:

1. Nine hundred and seventy-seven canceled checks of Mrs. H. H. Carper, drawn on the Arlington Trust Co., Arlington, Va., covering the period May 9, 1945, to October 31, 1951, inclusive.
2. Twenty-seven bank statements, Arlington Trust Co., Arlington, Va., showing the account of Mrs. H. H. Carper, from March 7, 1945, through July 24, 1951, inclusive.
3. Seven United States individual income tax returns, as follows:
 - (a) Return of Hialmar H. Carper, 1946.
 - (b) Return of Eunice R. Carper, 1946.
 - (c) Return of Hialmar H. Carper, 1947.
 - (d) Return of Eunice R. Carper, 1947.
 - (e) Return of Hialmar H. and Eunice R. Carper, 1948.
 - (f) Return of Hialmar H. and Eunice R. Carper, 1949.
 - (g) Return of Hialmar H. and Eunice R. Carper, 1950.
4. One 27-page financial questionnaire of Hialmar H. Carper.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement made by him before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor in support of S. 662, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Statement by him with reference to the Committee for a National Trade Policy and Mr. George W. Ball, in connection with the hearings on H. R. 1, providing for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES B. CONANT TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO THE REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the nomination of James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to the Federal Republic of Germany. Notice is hereby given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John R. Brown, of Texas, to be United States circuit judge, Fifth Circuit, vice Robert Lee Russell, deceased.

Ruben Rodriguez-Antongiorgi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico, for the term of 4 years, vice Harley A. Miller, resigned.

Robert W. Oliver, of Alaska, to be United States marshal, division No. 2, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years, vice Benjamin B. Mozee, term expired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Thursday, May 5, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

THE CHALLENGE OF MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today from Mr. Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, an important message concerning the need for comprehensive action for the strengthening of the mental health of the American people.

I have long felt that the forces of spiritual faith and science should be mobilized to the maximum in taking steps to assure sound minds and sound bodies for our people and, in particular, a healthful, cheerful, faithful outlook by them.

Mr. Gorman's message was accompanied by an important booklet depicting, in a wide variety of statistical material, the challenge to our country in this field.

I believe that it is most appropriate that this material be presented to my

colleagues in connection with the observance next week, in accordance with Presidential proclamation, of National Health Week.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1955.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In connection with the observance of Mental Health Week, May 1 to 7, the National Mental Health Committee encloses its 1955 edition of What Are the Facts About Mental Illness in the United States?

The highlight of the 1955 fact sheet is the increasing annual cost of mental illness to Federal and State Governments. During 1954 the overall cost of mental illness rose to a new high of \$2,867,877,000. In one area alone, the cost of caring for the mentally ill in Veterans' Administration hospitals, it has gone up a staggering 500 percent in a decade—from approximately \$44 million in 1945 to more than \$200 million in 1954.

Contrasted with these staggering expenditures for care and treatment of the mentally ill is the very insignificant sum spent on psychiatric research. During 1954, Federal, State, and private expenditures for private psychiatric research together amounted to only a little more than \$10 million.

The recent development of the Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis is a dramatic example of the enormous dividends resulting from medical research. Although only a relatively small amount of money was spent in the perfection of this vaccine, its success means the savings of millions of dollars in medical costs and, more important, the removal of fear and anxiety from the minds and hearts of millions of American families.

On April 12, on the momentous night when the success of the new vaccine was announced, Drs. Jonas Salk, Thomas Francis, and Alan Gregg appeared on Edward R. Murrow's See It Now broadcast from Ann Arbor. All three were in unanimous agreement that mental illness was the next big frontier facing medical research.

To conquer this great frontier we must begin now to finance a major journey to explore its many mysteries. This can only be done if the following goals are set:

1. The training of thousands of additional psychiatrists and auxiliary personnel, for new knowledge will go to waste unless it is applied promptly.

2. A gradual rise in the annual amount spent on psychiatric research until we reach a figure of at least \$100 million a year.

3. Immediate appropriation of Federal and local matching moneys for the construction of desperately needed psychiatric laboratory facilities.

4. The National Mental Health Committee, on behalf of the 46 State governors who are its honorary chairmen, appeals to you to help us achieve these objectives in the next few years. We enlist your help, not only during Mental Health Week, but throughout the entire year.

Cordially,

MIKE GORMAN,
Executive Director.

ASSISTANCE FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to hear from officers, members, and friends of chapters of the National Association for Retarded Children

relative to two important bills now pending before the House of Representatives.

One is H. R. 2205, introduced by Representative SMITH of Mississippi. It provides for payment under the Federal old-age and survivors system of children's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18, but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability.

The other, likewise by Representative SMITH, is H. R. 4278. It would allow additional tax exemption of \$600 for permanently and totally disabled dependents, including those who have attained age 18, but are unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity because of permanent physical or mental condition which began before the age of 18, as well as including those who have not attained the age of 18, but are likewise, unfortunately, incapable of gainful employment.

One parent in my State who wrote me endorsing this proposed legislation wisely recalled the ancient injunction beginning with the unforgettable words: Even as we do unto the least of these we do it unto Him.

I earnestly hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will be in a position to give its sympathetic attention to this proposed legislation in the interest of retarded youngsters and their parents.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND ON PROPOSAL FOR NEGOTIATION WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I issued yesterday afternoon, Wednesday, April 27, relative to the proposal for negotiation with Communist China.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

According to reports of the press conferences of yesterday and today, it is now intended to negotiate directly with the Chinese Communists.

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking powers.

Their minimum price will be a "down-payment" of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and the Pescadores.

They don't need a conference to bring about a cease-fire. All they need is to stop shooting and building up their aggressive forces in that area of the Formosa Straits.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist-pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Com-

munist China is an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou En-lai.

I for one do not believe the Communist leopard has changed its spots. Their objective has, is, and will continue to be the destruction of human freedom.

To me the State Department's statement of last Saturday seemed consistent with our long-established policy of expecting deeds rather than words as a prelude to another conference. It did not on Saturday and it does not now seem unreasonable that prior to such a conference American prisoners should be released in accordance with the terms of the Korean armistice. Nor did it seem unreasonable that the Communists place in effect in the area an immediate cease-fire.

Unless there is some formula regarding which I have not been advised and which is difficult for me to now envision, I find it hard to comprehend how we could enter into direct negotiations with Communist China without the interests of the Republic of China being deeply involved.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia and to Yalta with its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China.

Some unanswered questions are:

"Will a cease-fire cover the offshore islands as well as Formosa and the Pescadores?"

"If it does cover the offshore islands how can it be negotiated without affecting the Republic of China?"

"If it does not it still vitally and perhaps fatally concerns that nation."

"Will a cease-fire permit Communist access to the harbors of Foochow and Amoy and would the Republic of China be expected to sit quietly while watching the buildup of a large invasion fleet in the harbors as well as airpower in the adjacent mainland area?"

That we are at one of the great turning points of history I would not deny. Whether it is a turn for the better or for the worse only time will tell.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON CHEST X-RAYS FOR MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND STAFFS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, each year we appropriate funds to the United States Public Health Service for the grants-in-aid program for the States of our Nation. A considerable part of these funds are used in the battle against tuberculosis which continues to be our leading communicable disease problem. One of the cornerstones in the program to control and eradicate this disease is the search for unknown cases among apparently healthy people by using portable and mobile chest X-ray units. Such a unit will be available to us and the members of our staffs beginning at noon on Monday, May 2.

The X-ray unit will be located in the first-aid room of the Senate Office Building. Since we are living and working in a city where TB is prevalent, I strongly urge that the Members of the Senate and all the members of their staffs make use of this service while it is so readily available.

There is no charge for this service, which is being provided by the United

States Public Health Service, the District of Columbia Tuberculosis Association, and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

Detailed information concerning this X-ray program is available at the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama and would urge from this side of the aisle that we most certainly make use of the mobile unit referred to.

Mr. President, I have a very brief statement which I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

In the State of Minnesota, we have made great progress in controlling tuberculosis. This has been achieved through active cooperation between the general public, local and State health departments, and the tuberculosis associations. Failure to cooperate and actively participate on the part of any one of these groups would have greatly handicapped our efforts which are now paying us such great rewards in terms not only of saving human lives but also in the saving of both public and private funds.

I should also like to note that we have not become complacent toward this problem in Minnesota, for so long as there remains one active unhospitalized case there is the danger of that infection spreading to others.

Therefore, I wish to take this opportunity to offer my wholehearted endorsement to the statement of the senior Senator from Alabama, and to also urge that we and all the members of our staffs avail ourselves of this opportunity to protect ourselves and the members of our families and the community in which we are living.

AMENDMENT OF THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Monday, April 25, I introduced, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], a bill comprehensively amending the Refugee Relief Act.

The bill is now pending before the Judiciary Committee. I was very glad indeed to learn, from yesterday's press conference at the White House, of the President's statement that he favors revision of the present act. I promptly issued the following statement:

I am pleased that the President has at long last taken cognizance of the crippling defects in the Refugee Relief Act. I hope that the President's advocacy of amendments to the act will facilitate the holding of early hearings, favorable consideration, and speedy passage of suitable amendments. I, of course, will strongly press for approval of our bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 26, and an article from this week's issue of Life. It will be noted that these very interesting articles strongly support the

amendments which my colleagues and I have proposed, by means of the bill we have introduced.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 26, 1955]

RESCUING THE REFUGEES

Senator LEHMAN has proposed several amendments to the emergency Refugee Relief Act of 1953 designed, as he says, to rescue a law which Congress intended to be "a great undertaking in humanitarianism." That this was actually the intent of Congress when it passed the Refugee Act is open to some skepticism; but it was certainly the intent of many Members of Congress like Senator LEHMAN, and it was also the avowed purpose of the President at whose behest the act was introduced and adopted. Members of Congress who desired to exclude refugees from the United States rather than admit them loaded the measure with such restrictions in the name of national security as to make this expressed intent very difficult of fulfillment.

Had there been a will to make the administration of the act humanitarian, however, there might have been a way. But this was precluded by a stipulation in the law itself that the emergency refugee program be administered by the head of the Bureau of Consular Affairs. The head of this Bureau, handpicked by the enemies of immigration in Congress, is Scott McLeod, kingpin of the State Department's security system. Thus, as Edward Corsi so illuminatingly pointed out the other day, the refugee program was put into the hands of policemen, with its administration "dominated by the psychology of security."

Mr. McLeod is one of the impediments to immigration which Senator LEHMAN's amendments are expressly aimed to remove. The Senator's proposals make no reference to Mr. McLeod by name; had they done so, they would have involved an improper legislative interference with executive discretion. They simply provide that the administrator of the refugee program should be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate—which is precisely the way he should have been chosen in the first place.

Beyond this, Mr. LEHMAN would remove from the act a requirement that a 2-year security history be compiled for all refugees granted visas; the requirement is an absurd and unnecessary one in view of the stringent security standards of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which refugees as well as all other immigrants must meet. It thwarts the hope held out to escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who cannot possibly provide the requisite information. Mr. LEHMAN would also ease the present law's insistence that a home and job be guaranteed each refugee by an American citizen and permit the guaranty to be made by responsible organizations. And, finally, he would extend the life of the Refugee Act in order to make up for the time lost under Mr. McLeod's administration. These improvements are essential if the law is to become in reality, the "significant humanitarian act" which President Eisenhower called it nearly 2 years ago.

[From Life magazine of April 25, 1955]

IMMIGRATION—THE REAL ISSUE IS AN EVIL LAW

In scores of drab detention camps all over free Europe are thousands of men without a country. They have no home, no haven, and (so it has begun to seem to most of them) no hope. They are refugees, many of them displaced by the upheavals of World War II; others, victims of the cold war, are escapees who fled their homes behind the Iron Curtain rather than live in slavery.

Many of them did so in the belief that they could find refuge in the United States of America after passage of the 1953 Refugee Relief Act, which authorized the admission of 214,000 refugees.

How false that hope has so far been has just been emphasized by the peremptory dismissal of Edward Corsi, the Secretary of State's special assistant on refugee problems, only 3 months after he took the assignment. Corsi, who built a fine reputation in his long career as United States Immigration Commissioner and as Governor Dewey's labor commissioner in New York, claims he was fired because he was trying to do something about these refugees. Dulles says he was fired for trying to circumvent the restrictive features of the law. Whether Corsi or Dulles is right is not really the issue. The real issue is the Refugee Relief Act, which President Eisenhower called a new chance in life [for] 214,000 fellow humans. It has not worked.

The law was boobytrapped from the start. It requires the act to be run by the State Department's Security Administrator. This is Scott McLeod, a pleasant but unimaginative flatfoot. The law itself is so full of restrictions that McLeod cannot be entirely blamed for the fact that, after 20 months, only 158 escapees and about 1,000 refugees have managed to qualify. But certainly he is no man to speed things up.

One of the chief obstacles keeping refugees out is the requirement that each individual must have an individual American sponsor who guarantees a home and a job. Few Americans are willing to guarantee shelter and employment for people they have never seen. Under the old Displaced Persons Act, groups such as churches and unions could give blanket guaranties to a specific number. Moreover, the law makes each refugee give a detailed account of his last 2 years, requiring proof which escapees seldom have and certainly cannot go back to get. Most people have to spend nearly 2 years in a detention camp just in order to acquire this history. As a consequence of all this, the Refugee Act, instead of being a testament to American compassion, has become a sardonic travesty. Says one anti-Communist Albanian escapee, waiting hopelessly in an Italian camp: "It would be better if America did not have the law. First you raise our hopes and then you don't live up to it."

The Corsi controversy will serve a useful purpose if it succeeds in showing up the true nature of this McLeod cuckooland. If Dulles has damaged the Republican Party by firing Corsi, President Eisenhower can do it a great service by putting his prestige and support behind the best features of the several amendments now in the congressional hopper to eliminate the worst discriminations of the Refugee Act. In the meantime, the best service Eisenhower can pay the existing Refugee Act, as it is, would be to put it in sympathetic hands. That would mean firing Scott McLeod as Security Administrator, and that would be no great loss.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI DAVID DE SOLA POOL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on the evening of Thursday, April 21, a great and moving tribute was paid, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, to Rabbi David de Sola Pool, on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

Dr. David de Sola Pool has long been Rabbi of Congregation Shearith Israel, the oldest synagogue in America.

At the dinner, tributes were paid to Dr. Pool by President Eisenhower, Mayor Wagner, Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many other leaders of our Nation.

Dr. Pool is a wonderful man, by whose friendship I have been honored for more than 40 years. He is one of the great spiritual leaders of my faith, and has long been an outstanding civic leader, public servant, and scholar. He has earned the high respect and deep affection, not only of people of my faith, but also of millions of others of every race, creed, color, and national origin, who recognize him as an unflinching and vigorous fighter for the dignity of man and for freedom for all peoples.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, April 22, describing the dinner and the many tributes paid to Dr. Pool, be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. DE SOLA POOL IS HONORED AT 70—FETE ALSO CLOSES 300TH-YEAR CELEBRATION OF SHEARITH ISRAEL CONGREGATION

A thousand persons paid tribute last night to the Reverend Dr. David de Sola Pool, rabbi of Congregation Shearith Israel, the oldest in America, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.

The dinner, in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, also brought to an end the tercentennial celebration of the Shearith Israel Congregation, which was founded in September 1654, by 23 Jews who had just arrived in New Amsterdam.

President Eisenhower sent a message honoring Dr. Pool's "long years of accomplishment as a public servant, scholar, and spiritual leader."

Other tributes were paid by Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of The New York Times; Ralph E. Samuel, chairman of the American Jewish Tercentenary Committee; Mayor Wagner, Supreme Court Justice Edgar J. Nathan Jr., president of Congregation Shearith Israel, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Greeting his well-wishers, Dr. Pool said it was now clear that "we can never attain that world security through another worldly flight from reality or through a self-regarding pursuit of salvation for individuals, but only through a religion which like Judaism, seeks salvation for all mankind."

Mr. Sulzberger paid tribute to Dr. Pool as "a spiritual man and one recognized as such by the entire community."

He had directed his remarks largely to the concept of the responsibility of the newspaper reader, asserting that responsible newspaper readers were essential to the maintenance of a free and responsible press.

Mr. Sulzberger expressed confidence in the ability of American citizens to understand "the great forces that push them toward war or that help safeguard the peace." He said he did not believe that citizens of a country who "are well and truly informed" would ever be enemies of other peoples similarly informed.

Democracy, he said, requires a press that presents the news "without fear or favor of any party, sect, or interest and which acknowledges that the manner in which it presents the news is a matter of legitimate public concern."

"The newspaper can do only half the job," he said. "The reader must help himself by doing the rest. If you agree that responsible newspapers are essential to the exercise of all the other blessings of freedom, you must go a step farther and agree that responsible readers are necessary, too."

He defined the responsible reader as one concerned about the character of the newspapers he buys. In these hectic times, he

noted, the reader does not have time to read everything.

"The minutes he devotes to daily newspapers can either supply him the information he needs to be a good citizen," he said, "or they can bring him up to date on the state of prostitution in New York and the thinking of the third juror who found the young osteopath guilty."

"Which shall it be?"

"I repeat: If you want responsible newspapers you must be responsible readers."

Mr. Sulzberger took issue with those who believe that public opinion tends to be wrong in judging the vital issues of war and peace—that the public mind always lags behind events and is swayed by rumors, emotions, and fears rather than by realities. He said the great hope of democracy was a better and better informed citizenry.

GROUP RELATIONS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Samuel declared in his address that group relations in the United States were at an all-time high.

"Prejudice and bigotry, by the same token," he said, "are less prevalent than at any time in the 20th century."

"American Jews have lost their self-consciousness, in their adherence to their faith, in their organized and communal behavior, in their daily lives as human beings associating in their neighborhoods, their schools, their jobs, their businesses, with people of other beliefs and origins."

Mr. Samuel said the United States had come closer to achieving the American ideal of group harmony than ever a Hitler or a Khrushchev could have feared. He attributed what he called "this new friendliness in America" to many reasons, among them the celebration of the American Jewish Tercentenary. He said the telling of the story of the contributions made to America by Jews over the past 300 years had done much to create the warm and healthy flowering of a new friendliness in America.

Justice Nathan declared that Dr. Pool's life had epitomized Judaism and that he had won the respect of all citizens by reason of his untiring efforts to bring justice, freedom, and happiness to all mankind.

Mayor Wagner, referring to the first Jews who arrived in New Amsterdam in 1654, said: "There was no immigration legislation in those days—happily for them perhaps."

Mrs. Roosevelt appeared unexpectedly at the dinner to wish Dr. Pool a happy birthday. She said that through Dr. Pool's research into the history of the early Jews in New Amsterdam she had discovered that her family had close connections with the early Jewish congregation here.

Dr. Pool received a hand-illuminated testimonial from his congregation.

FORMOSA, QUEMOY, AND MATSU

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 21, when the announcement was made that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson had left for Formosa, I issued a statement on Formosa and the Quemoy and Matsu situation, reiterating my strong belief that Quemoy and Matsu are positions of weakness from which we should withdraw as rapidly as possible. The purpose of the withdrawal would be to strengthen our position, both vis-a-vis Communist China and vis-a-vis our allies.

I also pointed out that withdrawal from Quemoy and Matsu would greatly add to our strength, would greatly increase our prestige among our allies and among the uncommitted peoples of

Asia. It would be a move to strengthen our security and not to weaken it.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON RADFORD-ROBERTSON MISSION TO FORMOSA, AND THE QUEMOY-MATSU SITUATION

This morning's press carried the report that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Assistant Secretary of State, Walter Robertson, have left for Formosa.

The exact purpose of their visit has not, of course, been made public, but we can safely assume that their mission concerns the fateful decisions that have been made, are being made and are yet to be made in respect not only to Formosa, but more immediately to the question of the defense of Quemoy and Matsu.

There has been a sense of relief—a sense of relaxation of tension—felt throughout the country in recent days at the impression which has emanated from the State Department and the Defense Department that our officials are aware of the intense feeling in the country that we must not go to war, or risk war, over Quemoy and Matsu.

There were but few of us here in the Senate who took this position at the time the Formosa resolution was considered and at the time the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek was under debate.

Those few of us were joined by some other few Members of the Senate as the days went by and the enormous danger of the situation we confronted began to dawn on the country—the danger of disunion with our allies, the danger of a war without moral basis in which we could find ourselves alone, in Asia and in the free world.

The clear, sensible voice of Mr. Adlai Stevenson was heard some 10 days ago on this subject. His views epitomized, I think, the feeling of the American people. This feeling was surely conveyed to those in charge of our Government.

And so there has been a perceptible change of attitude in the executive department. Indeed, it was stated by Secretary Dulles that some of the proposals made by Governor Stevenson, which were a refinement of views which I and others had previously expressed on the floor of the Senate, were, in fact, being pursued by the United States Government.

This was a far different note from that which we had heard before. To the extent that these proposals are being pursued, I commend the administration and wish our officials every success.

I must say, however, that there is danger of confusion concerning the nature of the position which we occupy today with regard to Quemoy and Matsu. A mistaken impression is held in some quarters—a most dangerous impression, in my opinion—that Quemoy and Matsu represent positions of strength which we are willing to give up for a price.

In my opinion—it has always been my opinion—Quemoy and Matsu are positions of weakness from which we should and must withdraw as rapidly as possible. The purpose of the withdrawal would be to strengthen our position, both vis-a-vis Communist China and vis-a-vis our allies.

A withdrawal from Quemoy and Matsu would greatly add to our strength—would greatly increase our prestige among our allies and among the uncommitted peoples of Asia. It would be a move to strengthen our security and not to weaken it.

I am sure that the Chinese Communists, as well as the rest of the free world, would recognize it as such.

I think this truth is almost self-evident. Yet it is widely overlooked.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER IN ANSWER TO RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in Tucson, last week, the convention of the Arizona State Federation of Labor heard Mrs. Margaret Thornburg, of Washington, D. C., a director of the women's division of the Labor League on Political Education, label me as "one of the most hated men in the United States"; and I understand that the convention itself is reported to have adopted a resolution calling for the end of my political career.

I ask unanimous consent that my answer to those remarks be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

What transpired in Tucson should be of great concern to all Americans. There, a representative of the labor bosses from Washington used the word "hate." Hatred is the weapon of revolutionists, and I don't believe that she spoke for the majority of people of Arizona or the United States.

The meeting was interesting, too, because the political implications of what transpired in Tucson are pretty self-evident. It was just another clear indication that the professional labor bosses have taken over the Democratic Party and are calling all the plays.

What interests me particularly is the personal attack upon myself and the injection of the word "hated" into the picture. I have had many disagreements with the leaders of labor, both in Washington, and in Arizona, but the feeling of hatred has never entered my mind, and I sincerely believe it has never entered theirs. Stretching disagreement into hatred is one of the tools used by those who would destroy our way of life, as hatred creates class difference, and I hope that Mrs. Thornburg and the Arizona State Federation of Labor will soberly reflect on their intemperate language. But, because they injected the word "hate," I will have to refer to it in answering their charges.

My sole objective in the field of labor legislation has been to preserve the freedom of the individual workingman and woman and to protect them against abuse and coercion by either management or labor. To that end I favor and have favored what is commonly called "right-to-work" legislation. "Right-to-work" legislation is simply a prohibition against compulsory unionism. It prohibits employers and unions from entering into contracts which make union membership a condition of employment. It places the right to earn a living above any obligation to pay tribute, compulsory or otherwise, to professional labor bosses. The professional labor boss "hates" me for trying to deny him that compulsory tribute.

The right to work in Arizona is a part of our constitution, and elected officials are sworn to defend constitutions. I am trying to protect that portion of Arizona's constitution that gives a man the right to work, and which was voted in by an overwhelming majority of the people. It seems peculiar to me that any labor official would "hate" a public servant who is performing his sworn duty.

To that end I favor, and have favored, so-called "States' rights" legislation designed to retain in the States their inherent power to protect the individual workingman and woman and the individual citizen against the abuses and coercion involving minority strikes and secondary boycotts. The professional labor boss "hates" me for trying to deny him those illegal weapons.

To that end I favor, and was instrumental in obtaining, the enactment by Congress of the Communist Control Act of 1954, designed to eliminate from trade union leadership the Communists and fellow travelers who so notoriously dominate some unions. The purpose of that law is to free the individual workingman and woman from that Communist domination. Most professional labor leaders do not attack me openly for my stand on that legislation because to do so would be considered unpopular and unpatriotic. But the professional labor leader, nevertheless, "hates" me secretly for trying to deny him the fruits of labor dictatorship, whether Communist or otherwise.

Who are some of the professional labor leaders that "hate" me for these efforts on behalf of the individual working man and woman? Well, one of them is right in my hometown. Don Baldwin, czar of the Bartender and Culinary Workers Union "hates" me because, by violating the State's right-to-work law and the State antiminority picketing law, he virtually destroyed his own dictatorship. Another one is Maurice Travis, former secretary-treasurer of the National Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers and an avid believer in Communist control of the trade-union movement. Travis is under indictment for perjury. Another one is Walter Reuther, president of the CIO. He is a Socialist and believes in control of all phases of our lives by the Federal Government, except the activities of professional labor bosses. He "hates" me for my stand on States rights, because the States might infringe on his Federal license to victimize individuals through minority strikes and secondary boycotts.

I have long since recognized the disagreement between these professional labor bosses and my objectives in the field of labor legislation, but this has not deterred, and it will not deter, me one iota from my objectives to preserve the freedom of the individual against oppressive power by either labor or management. Hatred is the weapon of revolutionists, and I do not think that the majority of the people of this country are as yet in revolt against the institution of individual liberty.

THE RIGHT TO WORK—ADDRESS BY FATHER JAMES A. MAJOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 18, the Reverend Father James A. Major delivered an inspiring address on the subject of the right to work. His address was delivered before the 18th annual convention of the Northwestern Council of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers at Missoula, Mont.

Father Major discussed the ethical and moral questions relative to the right-to-work proposals. I was so much impressed with his address that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE SO-CALLED RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

First of all, may I extend good wishes for success in the work that lies ahead and for which you have assembled in convention.

A convention of this kind is a vantage point reached in the forward march of your organization. From it the record of past achievements can be reviewed, while from the study can be had guidance in the task of planning for the future.

Past accomplishments, worthy and commendable as they are, do not necessarily have in themselves the quality of finality, of a completeness. They are, as they were intended to be, the bases for such greater works as may be required to meet future needs.

Facing the future, however, is not a matter of prime importance. Its importance is only secondary. Of prime importance is faith in the future. It is faith in the future that provides the incentive whence come both initiative and enthusiasm. It is enthusiasm which generates the power of sustained endeavor and endurance.

Too often attempts to weaken a people's faith in the future are made by men saturated with the poisons of a materialistic philosophy, whose vision is so marred by the dollar sign that they cannot see the God-given dignity inherent in the human nature of their fellow men, and who in their blindness fail to recognize the inalienable rights with which those fellow men have been endowed by the Creator, and for the protection and preservation of which this constitutional democracy, called the United States of America, was forged upon the battlefield, with its various parts being cemented firmly with the warm blood of men who cherished their sacred heritage of God-given dignity and God-given rights.

Too often the devotees to greed for wealth and dominating power obstruct the cause of justice by intrigue. Too often they distort the truth and seek in high places approval of their distortions, the while they seek to confuse and deceive by questionable slogans or catch phrases the mind of an unsuspecting public. Too often they send their slogans throughout the land to peddle their ideologies, to be the salesmen of their errors. But well dressed as the ideologies may be, respectable as they may seem, and freely circulated as they are, they still remain the sinister agents of a group unscrupulous in aims and tactics, and cynical toward all social welfare measures which do not offer bankable gains.

In recent months the American people have had such salesmen of error trying to high pressure them into buying a certain commodity called right-to-work. This article has been heralded as a medicine with miracle performing properties. It has been publicized as a medicine which everybody should buy. In fact, it has been declared so indispensable a medicine for the cure of all industrial ills that its purchase should be decreed and enforced by law.

While 18 States have bought the commodity, the others as yet have not done so, although some loud voices are clamoring persistently for the purchase. Whether or not the purchase will be made will depend on the public's attitude. If the public remains indifferent to what the legislatures do, the purchase will be made; for the originators of the commodity are at no time indifferent. On the other hand, if the public shows any sign of an awakened interest the originators will not doff their hat and politely bid good-day. To the contrary, they will stick both feet in the doorway and renew their efforts, using every trick in the book of high-pressure tactics. For one thing, they are determined to make the sale; they are determined to get the legislatures to buy the medicine and administer it to their constituents; they are determined to have John Q. Public placed under their sedative. They want him in this condition so that he can easily be manipulated as a pawn on the chess board of dollars-and-cents, and, if neces-

sary, even be sacrificed to greater bankable profits.

If public indifference is to be overcome and public resistance is to be had, then public interest must be aroused. It must be an enlightened interest; for he guards best who best understands what he is guarding. To secure this enlightened interest a definite program must be carefully prepared, prudently directed, and steadily administered to the end that, the public will be correctly informed as to the poisonous contents of the medicine and the disastrous effects it will have on their sacred heritage of God-given dignity and God-given rights, should it be purchased through their legislatures, or taken by themselves in whatever dosage may be recommended to them.

Our allotted time will not permit a full study of this so-called indispensable remedy for industrial and economic ills. We may, however, make a partial study. To this end let us put the wonder drug under the microscope of logic, then drop it into the orientating principles of morality and ethics.

Under the microscope of logic we see one potent ingredient, technically called sophistry, popularly described as double talk. Consider briefly the terms right and work. Joined they make a catchy label. They appeal to one's innate sense of justice. They suggest economic security. Yet in these subtle suggestions they are deceptive. They speak the language of appearances, not the language of reality. They overexpand the meaning of the word right, they shrink the meaning of the word work.

In the Standard Dictionary, to work is defined thus: "To put forth physical or mental effort toward a set end." Note the extension of that definition. It includes mental effort. Accordingly it extends itself into the field of education, a factor of no slight concern; certainly not to Congress. For Congress refused to ignore the extension of the meaning when it debated the Child Labor bill some years ago. The right-to-work commodity is silent on this extended meaning. It uses the word as having no extension beyond the output of physical effort involved in manual toil. By so doing it shrinks the meaning unto its purposes, the while it presumes to be using the term honestly. This is sheer verbal trickery, shabby double talk, smacking of discriminatory class legislation, long ago outlawed by the Constitution.

It seems to me that this hidden ingredient has a realistic potency which educators should not ignore; for if the materialistic-minded man behind this "right-to-work" measure should find it to their advantage to step into the field of education later on, they have an open door. They need only to insist upon a complete extension of the word's meaning. They can point to the Standard Dictionary to prove the reasonableness of their demands. And the courts will have to go along. For once a law is upon the books the courts must abide by the terminology used. The educators might then find themselves facing a future devoid of opportunity for them to have any faith in the future, be it for themselves or for society. It seems to me that educators cannot afford to ignore this danger, nor sit back with any degree of indifference to the issues involved. Their own security is secretly jeopardized by the verbal trickery, the sophistry of the glib peddlers of error.

As for the word "right." What is a "right"? Simply it is this: a title of ownership to property, to a course of action, to an adherence to ideologies, and the like. By reason of their source, rights are either substantive or remedial. Substantive rights are those which are inherent in a man as a person; inherent because they have been received from the Creator as endowments—such as the rights to life, liberty, the pursuit of

happiness, and so forth. "Unalienable" the Declaration of Independence calls them. "Inviolable" the Constitution proclaims them. These rights have the quality of stability and permanency. Remedial rights are those which accrue to men from law. They are political in their source and are given for protection and preservation of the substantive, or natural rights.

Of such are the amendments to the Constitution (originally called the Bill of Rights) the first 10 of which were demanded by the Founding Fathers who were on guard against the dangers arising from language in which terms are used loosely. These fathers wanted to see the realities behind the words. They wanted words used in a way that did not permit of verbal trickery. For this reason they insisted on clarification of the terms "unalienable rights." They wanted specific listings of these rights. And they wanted them so that they could safeguard these rights against attempts by politicians to tamper with them by specious juggling of words or spurious interpretations.

Keeping before us these few observations, let us take a closer look at the word "right." Beneath the abstract notion we see the practical aspects. These aspects are two in number. One is called "possession," the other "use, or exercise." The distinction is real, not figurative. And it is vitally important. The common experience of every man, woman, or child bears out the fact that the possession of a thing, or a right, and the use of that thing, or right, are entirely different; that the mere possession does not always permit the use; that the possession is not destroyed just because the thing, or right, cannot or may not be used. Experience proves that the use of rights is permitted or justified only under certain conditions; never indiscriminately. In other words, experience teaches that, while man possesses rights, he does not always have the right to use those rights.

As we look at the commodity which we are urged to buy we find that it gives the word right an overextended meaning. It would have us believe that possession and use are inseparable; that the mere fact of possession includes the use—includes it unconditionally, so that a man in possession of a right may automatically and unconditionally assert, use, or exercise that right. It would have us believe that, because a man has a license to own and carry a loaded gun he has a license to use that gun whenever, wherever, and for whatever purpose he chooses. By way of corollary, it would have us believe that, because he has a right to fire the gun in any direction somewhere in the hills, he has the right to fire it any direction on a city street, even in the direction of a crowd of people leaving a theater; nor is he to be punished if he should fire it under those conditions. Briefly, the proponents of the "right-to-work" bill would have us subscribe to the proposition, as to a sound principle, that a man's right to possess a loaded gun carries with it unconditionally his right to do as he pleases with it; and that no one can do anything about the matter.

No; the mere possession of a right does not carry with it the permission to use the right indiscriminately. The exercise of rights is always conditional. And the basic, fundamental condition which supports the social superstructure, the while it protects, preserves, and promotes law and order—and through these makes possible and secure government—is the condition whereby the superior rights of society take precedence over the individual's use, or exercise of rights. The overextension of the meaning given to the word "right" by the proponents of the measure is sheer verbal trickery, sheer sophistry. And any legal decree based upon it is inimical to the public good; wherefore such a decree lacks the force of a law. No decree,

however well-dressed it may be with legal language, has the force of a law if it is adverse to the public good. Certainly not in a civilized society.

From these observations through the microscope of logic—necessarily limited as they are—let us now drop the ingredients of the commodity into the orientating principles of morality and ethics. Here again our observations must necessarily be limited. The most we can observe are a few salient points.

Wherever rights exist there also duties exist. In its positive aspect a duty consists in the recognition of, and respect for, the rights of another. In its negative aspect a duty consists in the noninterference with or the non denial of the possession or the use of the rights. This does not mean that a person's possession or exercise of rights is immune to their loss or curtailment by others. The giver of the rights may attach to the grant specific stipulations whereby the possession may be forfeited, or the exercise may be controlled. Thus, for the crime of murder the Creator has stipulated that the grant of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall be forfeit to the superior, corporate rights of society. Similarly, the civil law, in the name of the superior, corporate rights of society, stipulates forfeiture of the possession where certain crimes have been committed, and forfeiture of the exercise where the public good is involved and demands curtailment. Accordingly, recognition of, respect for, noninterference with, non denial of another person's rights constitute a duty only so long as that person has not forfeited the possession or the exercise of his rights. If forfeiture has been made, duty does not bind. And where duty does not bind, justice is not violated.

Dropped into these orientating principles of morality and ethics, what happens to the wonder drug, the right-to-work bill? Plainly, there is no question of forfeiture as regards the possession of the right to work. What is involved is not the possession but the exercise of the right. The right to work may be exercised on condition that it does not jeopardize the superior, corporate rights of society; or, to state it in other terms, when it does not pose a threat to the public good.

Because the laboring men and their families in these United States constitute the majority of the population, what affects them as a class affects the public good. And because as a class they have mutual, corporate interests wrapped up in the circumstances and conditions of their labor they have the right both on moral and ethical grounds to unite themselves freely into a unit, a union, through which they can act jointly, as well as effectively, for the protection and preservation of their immediate interests and those of society—the public good—with which their immediate interests are inseparably fused.

When the employees in a given industry have freely united themselves in such an organization dedicated to such purposes; and when by law they have had their organization recognized and their declared purposes sanctioned, then they constitute a legitimate society with sufficient properties as to make it an organic society. As a legitimate organic society they may use such means to secure their objectives as are found necessary and efficient, keeping those means at all times within the moral and ethical boundaries of reason and justice. When, therefore, they stipulate conditions for employment and insist on having these stipulations embodied in their negotiated contracts with management, they are placing controls on the exercise of a man's right to work in said industry. Note, they are not denying that the man has the right to work. They simply declare that the exercise of the right will be permitted if the man will comply with the conditions which have been found necessary for the security

of mutual, corporate interests. This demand does not violate justice. It is simply the application of the moral and ethical principle according to which the superior, corporate rights of legitimate society take precedence over the individual's unconditional, indiscriminate exercise of his right.

If the application in this instance is a violation of justice, then it is equally a violation of justice when the Government makes an application of the principle. And Government very definitely does make the application. It applies it in two instances. First, by curtailing the exercise of rights through the various amendments to the Constitution; and secondly, by obliging its citizens to surrender the peaceful, comfortable pursuits of homelife to the regimented, disciplinary, hazardous life of the soldier on the battlefield. And this notwithstanding its proclamation that man's rights to his life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness are inalienable, inviolate.

Any body of lawmakers, therefore, who ignore these moral and ethical principles and attempt to legislate in violation of them are violating justice. And justice miscarried is tyranny.

If the proponents of the bill—and they certainly are not the laboring men themselves—insist on legislation according to a materialistic philosophy; if they insist on rule by tyranny through miscarriage of justice, in the hopes of greater bankable profits, they are blind to the lessons which were taught by the Minute Men at Concord and Lexington. April 19, 1775, when in answer to Major Pitcairn's shout: "Disperse, ye villains," Capt. John Parker said to his 50 men of toll: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon; but if they mean to have war, let it begin here." Let the proponents remember that those men of toll were not cowards; that the words of their captain were not words of double talk. They had one clear meaning. And that meaning would be endorsed by action. It was. And how it was. For there, when men who would be free stood face to face with tyranny's agents, there was fired—in the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson—"the shot heard 'round the world."

If the public interests, as vested in the interests of the working classes, are to be undermined in legislatures by defiance of both the rules of sound logic and the principles of morality and ethics, then the States, like the instigators of the right-to-work bill, should be prepared to pay the price. For treason to human dignity begets slavery. And while slavery in the industrial world may provide cheap labor and fattened pocket-books for the would-be masters, it ultimately begets economic disaster both for the State—by loss of revenue derived from taxes on earned income—and for the special groups whose vision is so marred by the dollar sign that they invite slowdowns, production cut-downs, and not improbable permanent shut-downs of their plants.

Regarding such undermining legislation Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII have spoken out vigorously, declaring it a violation of moral principles and therefore forbidden. In his encyclical *Forty Years After Pius XI* stated definitely: "Labor is not a mere commodity. On the contrary, the worker's human dignity in it must be recognized. It therefore cannot be bought and sold like a commodity." In his message, Christmas 1942, Pius XII said: "If legislation is to play its part in the pacification of the community, it must prevent the worker . . . from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person."

Strongly does he condemn the tenet that, workingmen may by legislation be made subject to the will of industrialists as regards wages, working conditions, etc. Legislation, he declares, which puts the worker at the mercy of management, denying them the

use of united efforts—unions—to protect their mutual, corporate interests in securing decent, sufficient returns necessary for a decent, sufficient livelihood, is legislation which is contrary to the natural rights of men; hence contrary to moral principles and therefore is forbidden.

All three pontiffs have further declared that they are aware of the fact that, man is an individual person endowed with free will; that he is exercising his free will when he enters into an individual agreement with management regarding wages, conditions of labor, etc. But they insist strongly that, he is also a social being, so created by God. They point out that the rules of sound reasoning (logic) are violated by those who stress the exercise of personal rights, the while they ignore the obligations arising from the social nature of man. Such stress, they maintain, is placed on the theoretical aspect of the case, and this without any regard to the indispensable practical aspects. The matter, however, is not simply one of logic. It is an ethical, moral matter.

The fact that man according to his God-given nature is not merely an individual person but a social being places restrictions on the exercise of his freedom. He is not allowed to agree to wages which are insufficient to meet his own needs and those of his dependents. Neither is he allowed to agree to wages, or other conditions of labor, if in so doing he threatens to place fellowmen in the danger of receiving insufficient wages or enduring conditions of labor which are not consonant with human dignity. His social obligations override his personal choices in such matters; and any disregard of them is a violation of morality. In other words, the individual's exercise of his rights is conditioned by the superior rights of society. Nor is this principle to be voided by any legislative enactment.

These are only a few of numerous Papal pronouncements pertaining to social and industrial matters. They are, however, adequate to point up the insidious nature of legislation which undermines public interests under the guise of promoting them by so-called right-to-work laws. Economic disaster invited by specious legislation is never permitted by sound logic, or by ethical, moral principles.

Incidentally, this field of economic disaster should be explored by your organization on a nationwide scale. The findings should be publicized. By showing the effects of slave labor to industry and to the States which permit it, the hidden dangers of the right-to-work bill will be revealed, for "by their fruits you shall know them." Our study has been made, not in the field of the actual effects, but in the field of logic and moral principles. We have chosen this field, rather than the field of effects, because the immediate question is one of law. And where the enactment of a law is foremost on the docket, attention to the meaning of words and the combined rules of logic and moral principles becomes the first order of the day.

As you, therefore, review in this convention the record of past achievements and plan for the future, fail not to make provisions for a program of enlightened education, whereby public interest may be secured and public awareness of the dangers may be aroused. The future cannot be faced with indifference or lukewarmness. It must be faced with faith and courage and concerted action.

The stakes are high.

Human dignity is on the auction block.

It must not be bartered for bankable profits.

IS IKE AS INVINCIBLE AS DEWEY?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an unusually im-

portant article entitled "Is Ike as Invincible as Dewey?" It was published in the May 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IKE AS INVINCIBLE AS DEWEY?

"The Republicans," commented the Berkshire Eagle, "are once more conceding the 1956 elections to themselves."

The Eagle was taking note of a curious phenomenon—a concerted drive by Republican leaders to persuade the public (and possibly the current occupant of the White House, too) that Ike is invincible in 1956. Of course within Republican strategy circles, the slogan "Ike Is Invincible" is translated, "Ike Is Indispensable."

But the "Ike Is Invincible" line does not belong solely to official Republican spokesmen. Almost without exception, an Eisenhower victory in 1956 is being accepted as an unarguable fact by political writers, columnists, and commentators.

Noting the unanimity with which his colleagues were conceding the election many months before the voters had had a chance to make up their own minds, one columnist commented, "I'm beginning to get worried. This sounds too much like 1948 when we were all telling each other that the Republicans were a 'shoo-in.'"

There are many similarities between the prevailing psychology today and the thinking in 1948 that prompted Life magazine to caption a picture of candidate Dewey, a week before the election, as the next President of the United States. One similarity is the rapt attention most commentators are devoting to the public-opinion polls, which show that a very large percentage of the people polled still think kindly of the President, but which admittedly do not purport to bridge the gap between liking Ike and voting for another 4 years of Ike and Republican Government. These, incidentally, are the same opinion polls that knew positively that Dewey was going to be elected before the people knew it themselves.

But perhaps the most striking parallel with 1948 is the prevailing opinion that the Democrats lack issues that will have a decisive popular appeal in the 1956 campaign. This was also the popular view in 1948, even among reporters who accompanied Mr. Truman on his "give 'em hell" whistlestop trips, and who persisted in this belief right up to election day. It wasn't until after the voters had confounded the pollsters and the pundits that these reporters began to think back over the campaign, and to discover that there had been, all along, an impressive list of issues—such as taxes, housing, inflation, farm slump, power, and reclamation cutbacks—issues that Mr. Truman had brought to the voters with great force.

Reviewing the issues that played an important part in the 1948 election, it appears that most, if not all of them, are present again today, or are developing into major issues for the 1956 elections. The issue of tax reduction is a perfect example. The Republican 80th Congress insisted on cutting taxes by \$5 billion. Then, as now, they proudly claimed that this was the largest tax cut in United States history. Then, as now, the major part of the tax relief went to wealthy individuals and to corporations. Then, as now, Democrats pressed for tax relief for lower income-tax payers, through an increase in the personal exemption. Then, as now, this effort was opposed by the Republicans in Congress, almost to a man, and was defeated. The Republican "rich-man's tax bill" became a major issue in the 1948 campaign.

The farm vote is most often credited with defeating Mr. Dewey and electing Mr. Truman. What stirred up the farmers most was the fact that the 80th Congress had de-

prived Mr. Truman of the authority to provide the added grain-storage facilities which were needed to get price-support loans.

In the summer and fall of 1948, corn and wheat prices fell off sharply as bumper crops overflowed existing storage bins, and thousands of farmers were forced to go without price supports. Today, farm income is sliding—down 10 percent in 1954—and the buying power of the farmer's income is at the lowest point since 1940. Despite this, the administration continues to think of price supports merely as protection against undue disaster and administration spokesmen continue to say that the solution to the farm problem is to get the small inefficient farmer out of agriculture.

The workingman, as well as the farmer, had reason to vote against the Republicans in 1948, for the GOP 80th Congress had enacted over President Truman's veto, the Taft-Hartley Act. Today, the workingman again has compelling reasons for mistrusting the GOP; not only has the President failed to fight for the Taft-Hartley changes he promised in the 1952 campaign; he has also packed the National Labor Relations Board (which administers the Taft-Hartley Act) with avowedly promanagement men who have succeeded in toughening up Taft-Hartley in practice, even though the law itself remains the same. Union men also get a hint of the President's attitude toward labor versus business from the list of guests at the Eisenhower stag dinners. Up to the time this information was classified secret by the White House, the guest list had included 294 businessmen, and only 8 union officials.

Another issue that spans both 1948 and 1955, and that affects the workingman and his family, is whether the Republicans are willing and able to control economic boom and bust. In 1948, inflation was the main threat and President Truman repeatedly asked the GOP 80th Congress to give him power to put the lid on prices. When the Republicans turned a deaf ear—even during the famous "turnip day" special session of Congress following the two conventions, President Truman took the inflation issue to the people.

Today there is far more danger of deflation than inflation, but the Republicans have shown themselves equally unwilling to take positive action to meet that danger. The President talks about an economy that should expand by \$14 billion a year. Yet neither he nor his economic advisers seem very concerned about the fact that in 1954, the economy shrunk by nearly \$8 billion; and at one point, Treasury Secretary Humphrey told Congress he didn't think 4 million unemployed was an excessive figure. The efforts of Democrats to warn of the growing slack in the economy are shrugged off by administration officials as gloom and doom, and Democratic efforts to bolster consumer purchasing power by tax relief for lower income families are decry as irresponsible and inflationary.

In 1948, as he "whistle-stopped" throughout the Western States, President Truman pounded home the way in which the Republican 80th Congress had decimated the reclamation and public power programs launched by the Democrats. As a result, Mr. Truman swept every Mountain and Western State except Oregon.

In 1954, Oregon furnished the clearest evidence (in the surprise election of RICHARD NEUBEGER as the first Democratic Senator from Oregon in 40 years) that the public power and reclamation slowdowns, plus the resource giveaways of the Eisenhower administration are redhot issues in the West. Hells Canyon, the greatest undeveloped waterpower site left in the United States, lying along the Idaho-Oregon border, promises to focus the power issue sharply in 1956. The Eisenhower administration favors turning over the power site to the Idaho Power Co., at the expense of wasting one-third

of the available waterpower; while Democrats in both the House and Senate are pushing a bill for a Government dam that will turn out larger amounts of power at lower rates.

Moreover, the Dixon-Yates deal, in which the President directed the Atomic Energy Commission, against the wishes of a majority of its members, to sign a 25-year contract with a favored utilities syndicate not yet formally in existence, has helped to dramatize the administration's tender concern for the private power utilities.

Of course the controversies of 1956 will not be confined to those that have an exact parallel in 1948. There will be other vital issues: One of the most prominent is the crisis in our schools and the Republican versus the Democratic methods of coping with it. Although the President acknowledges a shortage of over 300,000 classrooms, he has proposed a cumbersome school-aid program which 40 State school officials have opposed in whole or in part, which forces the States and localities to rely almost entirely on their own nearly exhausted resources, and which in fact imposes higher costs on States and local school districts, mainly for the benefit of bond brokers and bankers. The Democrats, on the other hand, have proposed a \$1 billion emergency school-aid program which can be put to work building schools just as soon as the States put up matching funds.

Another administration program that seems designed mainly for the benefit of banks and other lending institutions is the highway program. Because of the devious financing methods proposed by the administration, the taxpayers will have to spend roughly \$2.7 billion in needless interest payments on highway bonds. Here again, Democrats in Congress have a more direct program to propose as an alternative, one which avoids the high-interest payments.

Some skeptics, may wonder if any of these issues will have enough impact on the voters to carry the day in November 1956. The same question was asked in 1948, all during Mr. Truman's campaign. When the election was over, however, most analysts concluded that it wasn't any one of these issues, taken separately, that had had the decisive impact. It was the fact that they all added up to one very simple and overwhelming truth: Government under the Republicans is, by and large, government for the few, while the Democrats represent government for the many.

Judging from the 1954 congressional elections, 2 years of Republican rule was enough to convince a majority of the voters that this truth still holds good, for despite President Eisenhower's personal intervention in last fall's election, he became the first President of this century to lose control of both Houses of Congress 2 years after his first election to office.

And, as 1955 progresses, government for the few becomes more rather than less apparent: Democratic tax cuts for the many are again pitted against Republican tax cuts for the few; an administration school-aid program written with the help of bankers for the benefit of bankers versus a Democratic bill to build more schools as soon and as economically as possible; a GOP electric-power program that favors the utilities is pitted against one designed to bring the most power at the lowest cost to the consumers.

Nor will government for the few be the only issue in the 1956 campaign. There will be the administration's foreign policy, best described by the phrase, "Diplomacy by bluff"—the bluffs of liberation, unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek, massive retaliation, agonizing reappraisal, and the blustering confusion of the administration's course in Indochina.

There will be the question of the administration's huckstering in dealing with the American people; the pie-in-the-sky cam-

paign promises of 1952 on which the Eisenhower crusade came to office, but which have been so largely unfulfilled; the numbers racket in the Government security program; and the sloganeering which tries to magnify a \$200 million Federal outlay into a \$7 billion school-aid program.

Finally, there will be a. w. o. l.—administration without leadership—the specter of a government in which cabinet officers contradict each other, and operate at variance with the President, with complete impunity; of a political party in which leading spokesmen openly defy the President's wishes, without a word of protest from the White House, of a President who tolerates the release of secret and explosive documents without his knowledge or consent.

One Democrat commented recently, "Maybe all the good issues we have won't be enough to win in 1956. But," he added dryly, "I think it will be worth our while to go through with the election even though the Republicans have conceded it to themselves again."

RECOMMENDATION OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION TO ELIMINATE QUANTITY DISCOUNT RULE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, businessmen of Minnesota are seriously and understandably concerned over the report of the Attorney General's committee to study the antitrust laws, which they quite rightly feel is a sharp blow to independent business in this country.

Because a letter sent to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald April 1 by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, effectively states the same concern expressed by hundreds of letters to me from Minnesota small businessmen, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 1, 1955.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note with considerable interest the editorial in the April 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Competitive Business. I am just wondering whether real competitive business exists in our overall economy today.

The conclusions reached in these remarks do not come about from experience as a professional trade association executive, or from the study of textbooks, but, on the other hand, from the school of hard knocks, either through having owned and operated an independent business establishment for better than a quarter of a century or more or for close to 50 years in the overall having basic factual knowledge of what is happening affecting the whole small-business structure of our economy.

To substantiate this view a good glaring example regarding competitive business is the recent happenings in the sale of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants to private industry.

It was a most unfortunate situation for those few Members of Congress who asked the Congress to stop, look, and listen before this deal was consummated that their opposition could have been helped if the independent factors in the rubber industry had come forward and expressed their fear of what would take place in the sale of these plants to giants, both in the rubber and oil industry. The reason they did not come forward was because of their fear of retaliation.

In my official position with the federation as vice president in charge of the legislative activities, many cases are channeled through our hands during any given year from independent business of all descriptions, both at the production and distribution level. In many of these cases which come to our attention the reports are of alleged violations of the antitrust laws. When we dig into these cases and find that the charges can be substantiated we request of the members: "Do we have the privilege of disclosing the source of our information to either the antitrust agencies of the Government or to congressional committees?" and in 99 cases out of 100 the answer is "We would like to grant this privilege, but we are fearful of retaliation from our source of supply." Would you call this real competitive business as we know fair competition should be?

In the very first instance if there had been consistent, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, and particularly the Robinson-Patman Act, there would never have been any need for independent business or their few sincere leaders to demand new legislation such as the Fair Trade Acts, so as to give fair competition in the retail field.

You said in your editorial, which we quote in part: "But it is unanimous in recommending retention and strengthening of the antimonopoly acts." Let us see how sincere the study committee was in their recommendation on this above quote.

Page 177 in the report of the Attorney General's Committee discloses its disapproval of another section of the Robinson-Patman Act. This section is known as the "quantity limit proviso." The act authorizes and empowers the Federal Trade Commission to take action against price discriminations based upon quantity discounts, but only after the Commission finds as a fact that the challenged discount system is unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly.

Yet the committee in its report states: "We deplore this singling out and penalizing of the quantity discount system." In other words, the committee recommends elimination of that section of the law.

The truth of the matter is that this section of the Robinson-Patman Act is looked upon by small business as the heart of the act, namely, that it is the special and preferred discounts given to a few which causes the chaos for small factors both in the production and distribution field.

This section of the act has been in the law since the creation of the law in 1936 and no attempt was made by the Federal Trade Commission to invoke this section even though the Commission was well aware of the fact that in certain industries the discount system in that or those industries was unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly.

The action which was instituted in the summer of 1947 was upon due urging by small business, through the National Federation of Independent Business, with the cooperation of the House Small Business Committee.

Some few years later, after due public hearings, etc., the Commission invoked that rule under the law and the actions of the Commission have been challenged through the courts, where a final decision is still pending—and it will be found that one of the principal legal opponents to the rule is the present Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, who it would also appear is one of the signees of the report of the Attorney General making the above recommendation.

We question the sincerity of the committee in its report on this major subject.

It will be interesting to note that in a letter dated February 21, 1955, directed by the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission to the Chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Commission stated:

"The Commission believes that the antitrust laws afford means of dealing with competitive abuses in the distribution of tires. It is aware of the problems of the small tire dealer, particularly the inequitable price leverage which may be exerted by a giant rival able to purchase in far greater quantities, and thus at a lower price. The quantity-limit proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act empowers the Federal Trade Commission to fix quantity limits where available purchasers in greater quantities are so few as to render price differentials based thereon unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly."

I believe we have proved our charge of lack of good faith by the study group to bring about the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Again we quote from your editorial: "The urgent need, as one dissenter put it, is for more rather than less antitrust enforcement." In reviewing the list of members of the legal profession from the Washington area it will be found that one former high Government career man, then a ranking member of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, told a Senate committee in February 1947 and we quote, that "For 35 years or more the administrations had merely given lip service to the enforcement of the antitrust laws." We wonder, in these conferences, if the committee took into consideration his findings as a high-ranking member of that agency? The gentleman should be in a position after his years of extensive experience in antitrust enforcement to know what he was talking about.

In conclusion, it was a matter of common gossip and public information from the inception of the study group that they would recommend the repeal of the Fair Trade Acts. That was the easiest course to pursue, and if such action is adopted by the Congress the victims will be millions of small businesses throughout the Nation, including the smaller producers—and this will be felt if and when this Nation of ours ever really gets back to a peacetime economy.

Finally, constructive small business of this Nation is not looking for any handouts, subsidies, or even any special preferred legislative help, but they do and must insist on a fair break to exist in our overall economy, and this can only be brought about—not by study groups composed of lawyers and economists—but for the Government itself to show its sincerity through speedy and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

When the day comes that these antitrust laws—and particularly the Robinson-Patman Act—are further weakened, small business better get wise and put a lock on their door because they are through.

It is my hope that in the interest of small business this letter may appear in its entirety in your valued publication.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation
of Independent Business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the comments in that letter about the Commission's recommendation to eliminate the existing quantity discount rule under the Robinson-Patman Act. The Commission's report was signed by Edward Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. It is significant to note that Edward Howrey was counsel of record for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., one of the opponents to the quantity discount rule now seeking to upset it in the Federal courts, up until the time he was confirmed as a member of the Commission and later as Chairman.

I also ask unanimous consent to enter in the RECORD, an article from the Akron Beacon Journal of Thursday, March 31, telling how this recommendation plays right into the hands of the tire firms in their effort to defeat the Federal Trade Commission's 1951 order putting a ceiling on tire and tube discounts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TRADE ORDER HIT—TIRE FIRMS
UPHELD IN DISCOUNT STUDY

(By Milt Freudenheim)

WASHINGTON.—A 61-member national committee to study the antitrust laws today advised Attorney General Brownell it "deplores" Federal quantity limit restrictions now being tested in court by most of the tire manufacturers.

The report seems sure to be picked up by the tire firms as an important aid to their effort to defeat the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) 1951 order putting a ceiling on tire and tube discounts.

The committee was headed by Assistant Attorney General Stanley Barnes of the Justice Department Antitrust Division and Prof. S. C. Oppenheim, of University of Michigan Law School, with top private attorneys and economists included.

FTC Chairman Edward Howrey also signed the report but stated "This should not be construed as a prejudgment of issues which may come before the Commission in individual cases."

Barnes also said the committee report does not bind the Justice Department. He declined to comment on the quantity limit criticism because it is under litigation.

But Barnes said many of the findings in the 394-page report are likely to be read by judges and cited by lawyers.

However, the Justice Department will ignore the report and go ahead with its announced intention of moving for summary judgment in the case brought by the tire companies seeking to upset the 1951 FTC order.

Special assistant to the Attorney General, Albert Parker, in charge of the case, said he expects to file his motion within a week or 10 days.

The case has been in Federal court more than 2 years. A FTC contention that the suit was premature was overruled on appeal. The case now will be tried on its merits.

The FTC rule, invoked for the first time against the tire firms, would limit the maximum discount to buyers of tires and tubes to that allowed on single carload purchases.

The tire companies say the rule would upset their established business arrangements selling to oil companies, mail-order houses, and other large customers.

The Oppenheim-Barnes report has this to say about the discount rule:

"At all events, the proviso necessarily aims to threaten price differentials which reflect economies in efficient distribution—thus offending the consumer interest which the cost defense was designed to preserve.

"We believe that any rational antitrust policy must leave the American business community free to explore new methods of distribution.

"Arrangements to impede distributive techniques have long been viewed as unreasonable restraints of trade.

"Hence we deplore this singling out and penalizing of the quantity discount system.

"And while a free economy must place primary reliance on the play of market forces as the determinant of price, the quantity limits proviso, in our view, defeats this policy through ineptly sanctioning a crude form of price fixing by administrative fiat where

competition should safeguard the public interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Burger has performed a service to independent business of the country by calling public attention to the dual role of Mr. Howrey as representative of an interested party in a dispute over FTC regulations, who has now become Chairman of the FTC. Mr. Burger has, in a letter to the President, called for removal of FTC Chairman Howrey.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the National Federation of Independent Business, containing a copy of Mr. Burger's letter to the President, and subsequent news clippings from the Akron Beacon Journal, the Wall Street Journal, and the New York Times about the requested removal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1955.

A demand for the removal from office of Federal Trade Commission Chairman Edward F. Howrey was made to President Eisenhower today by the National Federation of Independent Business through its vice president, George J. Burger.

In a strongly worded letter to the President, Mr. Burger charged that Chairman Howrey, because of his previous legal background in representation of cases before the Federal Trade Commission "would have his hands tied" in carrying out his full responsibility under the law as Chairman and as a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

In his letter, Mr. Burger reiterated that there was nothing of a personal or political nature involved, but that the situation was serious enough to call for the special attention of the President.

Following is the text of the letter directed to the President:

APRIL 6, 1955.

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The matter which we are bringing to your attention in this communication is one we believe is so serious that it requires your immediate and personal attention.

We are referring to the responsibility of the man now holding the top position (Chairman) of the Federal Trade Commission.

This communication has no reference to, and must not be considered as such in, any personal attack, and also must not be considered as a political move, as we have no interest in personalities or the political lineup.

Our action in bringing this to your attention is for the overall good of the American public and, secondly, for the good of small business nationwide through an impartial, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

We have maintained from the very first that people going into high positions in the Government, irrespective of what their personal opinions on the laws might be, when they take an oath of office to enforce the laws, we expect them to carry out to the fullest degree their oath of office, with no exceptions or omissions.

Based on this premise, we are making two specific charges against the administration of the laws entrusted to the Federal Trade Commission, now headed by Mr. Edward F. Howrey:

"Charge No. 1 is Mr. Howrey's inability to act on the entire matters coming before the

Commission, in view of his previous legal connection as attorney of record for many clients who now have cases pending against them before the Federal Trade Commission on antitrust laws violations, on cases coming within the confines of the FTC jurisdiction."

To clarify this charge, it must be brought to your attention that Mr. Howrey stated at the time of his appearance before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, March 18 and 19, 1953, which committee was considering his nomination as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, that he would divorce himself from any participation in cases before the Commission with which he had previously been connected in his private capacity.

Mr. President, charge No. 2 is the natural outcome of Mr. Howrey's inability to act as set forth in charge No. 1.

"Charge No. 2 is that because of the divorcement or disassociation cited in charge No. 1, it would of necessity follow that he must divorce himself from numerous other cases similar in nature coming before the Commission, to those which he had represented before the Commission in his private capacity."

This charge is based on the fact that he would be unable to act impartially even though there had been no previous connection with the case in question.

The concern of the Senate committee at the time of his appearance before them was as to what action he would take due to his previous legal background in representation of clients before the Federal Trade Commission. Along this line of questioning by the members of the committee it is well to note the statement of Senator MAGNUSON:

"I am afraid that you might be on a vacation almost permanently down there."

You will find, Mr. President, through the committee's action at that time in the examination of Mr. Howrey, their concern about a section of the Robinson-Patman Act, namely, the quantity discount rule, and at that time Mr. Howrey was counsel of record for a very large factor in a major industry who was opposing the adoption of that rule under the law for that particular major industry.

At the time of my appearance before the Senate Commerce Committee on March 18, 1953, in opposing Mr. Howrey's nomination, I said:

"We put the question to the committee in behalf of small business of this Nation, Is it possible a gentleman going into this high position in the Federal Trade Commission can in reality serve two masters?"

Now, a little over 2 years later we find the suspicion registered in our question to the committee is confirmed through Mr. Howrey's actions, where he, as a member of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, which report was made but a few days ago, signed that report, with others, recommending the elimination of the quantity discount rule under the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is significant and important to note, Mr. President, that with reference to the above action, Mr. Howrey is quoted in the press, with reference to his signing of the report recommending the repeal: "This should not be construed as a prejudgment of issues which may come before the Commission in individual cases."

In view of this alarming situation we again ask, "How can Mr. Howrey render to the Agency as its head the full requirements in the enforcement of the laws entrusted to that Agency by the Congress of the United States?"

It is for this reason, Mr. President, in behalf of small business of this Nation, that we earnestly and sincerely request the removal of Mr. Howrey from his position as

Chairman and as a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal of April 8, 1955]

BURGER CALLS ON IKE TO FIRE HOWREY

WASHINGTON.—George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, today made public a letter to President Eisenhower calling on him to fire Edward F. Howrey, Federal Trade Commission chairman.

Burger, a professional foe of tire manufacturers, based his request on Howrey's part in signing a recent antitrust advisory report calling for abolition of the quantity discount rule in the Robinson-Patman Act.

The discount rule now is in the courts, with the tire makers fighting the FTC rule.

Howrey, a former attorney for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., has disassociated himself from all tire cases.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 11, 1955]

SMALL BUSINESS SPOKESMAN ASKS OUSTER OF HOWREY

WASHINGTON.—The head of an organization which claims to speak for small businessmen asked President Eisenhower to fire the Federal Trade Commission's present chairman, Edward F. Howrey.

In a letter to Mr. Eisenhower, George J. Burger, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., said Mr. Howrey is unfit to head the FTC because of his "previous legal connection as attorney of record for many clients who now have cases pending against them before the Federal Trade Commission."

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1955]

REMOVAL OF HEAD OF FTC IS URGED— SMALL BUSINESS GROUP SAYS HOWREY'S LEGAL PRACTICE TIES HIS HANDS IN JOB

WASHINGTON, April 8.—A demand for the removal of Edward F. Howrey as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission was made today by the National Federation of Independent Business.

The federation's vice president, George J. Burger, wrote to President Eisenhower. He said that Mr. Howrey, because of his legal background in representing clients before the Commission, "would have his hands tied" in carrying out his responsibility.

The federation asserts it has a membership of 100,000 individual small-business men.

A high official of the Commission said Mr. Burger had been carrying on a running attack against Mr. Howrey ever since his appointment to the Commission 2 years ago. In fact, it was stressed, the federation head testified against Mr. Howrey when a Senate committee considered his nomination.

This official declined specific comment on the Burger letter to President Eisenhower. Mr. Howrey could not be reached for his reaction to it.

Mr. Burger did not say why he had chosen this particular time to direct the attention of President Eisenhower to his long time criticism of Mr. Howrey.

However, he noted that the Commission Chairman had been a member of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws. As a member he had signed a recent report of the committee recommending legislative changes that Mr. Burger's organization feels inimical to the interests of small business.

At the Commission, it was explained that, while Mr. Howrey took part in the studies of the Attorney General's committee, he had not voted on any of its specific recommendations. Also, it was asserted, Mr. Howrey, in

signing the report as a whole had stated that his doing so should not be construed as his prejudicing issues that might come before the Commission in individual cases.

Mr. Burger made two charges:

First, "Mr. Howrey's inability to act on the entire matters coming before the Commission in view of his previous legal connection as attorney of record for many clients who now have cases pending against them before the Federal Trade Commission on anti-trust laws violations."

Second, that because of the divorcement or dissociation cited in the first charge "it would of necessity follow that he must divorce himself from numerous other cases similar in nature coming before the Commission to those which he had represented before the Commission in his private capacity."

SECOND CHARGE EXPLAINED

The second charge, Mr. Burger said, "is based on the fact that he would be unable to act impartially even though there had been no previous connection with the case in question."

Mr. Burger added that when Mr. Howrey appeared before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on March 18 and 19, 1953, when his nomination was being considered, he testified that he would divorce himself from any participation in cases before the Commission with which he had previously been connected in his private capacity.

The Senate approved the nomination on March 23 and the next day the President named him chairman to succeed James M. Mead, of New York. Mr. Mead, a former Democratic Senator, remains a member of the Commission.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TEX., TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 14.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 14) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 12, after the word "used," it is proposed to strike out "primarily", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Texas all right, title, and interest of the United States, in and to the following-described land in Austin, Travis County, Tex., together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land, including approximately one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres out of the original 200 acres known as the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range Tract, also referred to as the "old Delson farm":

Beginning at the southwest corner of the 53 acre tract heretofore conveyed to J. J. Gasser by deed dated February 23, 1895, recorded in volume 129, page 347, of deed records of Travis County, Tex., said corner also being the southwest corner of the thirty-eight-and-fifty-five-one-hundredths-acre State tract No. 2 surveyed March 30, 1934, by M. V. Homeyer, county surveyor;

Thence north 60 degrees west, with the original line dividing the Townes and Mabin

tracts 1.113 varas to a stone corner on the east line of the W. C. Phillips timber tract;

Thence with the east line of said W. C. Phillips tract, north 36½ degrees east one thousand eight and eighty-two one-hundredths varas to a point; said point being south 36½ degrees west one hundred thirty and sixty-eight one-hundredths varas from a stone corner on the south line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east along the south lines of the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel comprising five and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps, armory parcel comprising 5 acres, four hundred seventy-eight and eight-tenths varas to a point, the southeast corner of the said Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel;

Thence north thirty degrees east with and along the east line of the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, one hundred twenty-nine and five-tenths varas to a point on the southerly line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east one hundred forty-six and eight-tenths varas to an angle in the stone fence dividing the Delson and Thiele tracts;

Thence with said fence on the dividing line between the Delson and Thiele tracts and also the Delson and Reid tracts, south one hundred and sixty-eight varas to a point;

Thence south fifty-seven degrees east one hundred and sixty varas to a point;

Thence southeast one hundred and eight varas to a point;

Thence south nine degrees west one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south ten degrees east one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south five degrees west eighty-six varas to a point;

Thence south three degrees east seventy-seven varas to the southwest corner of the Elanor Reid tract on the north line of the Gasser fifty-three-acre tract;

Thence north sixty degrees west with the north line of the Gasser tract, one hundred and forty-seven varas to the northwest corner of same;

Thence south thirty degrees west with the west line of said Gasser tract, six hundred forty and one-half varas to the place of beginning;

Containing in all one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres of land more or less together with all improvements thereon, said land being the remaining portion of the original two hundred-acre tract conveyed by deed from Eliza C. J. Delson, et al., to the United States of America, dated June 28, 1909, as same appears of record in volume 239, pages 82-84, inclusive, of the deed records of Travis County, Texas, after deducting therefrom the five and eighty-nine one-hundredths-acre United States Air Force parcel and the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel above described, a total of ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres to be retained by the United States.

Sec. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this Act shall be reserved to the United States.

Sec. 3. There shall be further reserved to the United States in the conveyance of the above-described lands, rights of ingress and egress over roads in the above-described lands serving buildings or other works operated by the United States or its successors or assigns in connection with the ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres referred to in section 1 of this act as the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, rights-of-way for water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, powerlines,

and such other utilities as now exist, or which may become necessary to the operation of the above-described ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Texas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Texas during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 5. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Texas, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Texas, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief statement which I have prepared on the bill printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Texas title to approximately 189 acres of land in Travis County, Tex.

The land to be conveyed would be used primarily for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes.

The land comprises the major part of a 200-acre tract purchased by the United States in 1909 for the sum of \$5,000. It has been used since then by the Texas National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps.

No monetary consideration is involved in the proposed conveyance. Rights to repossess the land if needed during a national emergency would be retained by the United States.

I urge passage of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, desires to propose two amendments to the bill. They are standard amendments, and I have no objection to them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, they are merely clarifying amendments, and I now offer them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 17, after the word "made", it is proposed to strike out "by the State of Texas during its occupancy" and insert in lieu thereof "during its occupancy by the State of Texas."

On page 6, line 6, after the word "thereon", it is proposed to insert "during its occupancy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas if this bill complies in all respects with the so-called Morse formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are three bills which I am asking the Senate to consider at this time. They are similar in nature. I am informed that they comply not only with the Morse formula but with the formula of the Armed Services Committee in such cases.

Mr. AIKEN. I was interested to know if there had been a change of heart on the part of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] since he moved across the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know that the Senator from Oregon has had any change of heart with respect to his so-called formula since he moved across the aisle. It may be that it has resulted in amending bills to make them comply with his formula.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the bill require the State of Texas to pay for the land involved in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; and I do not understand that the Morse formula requires any State to pay for land which is to be used exclusively for National Guard purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. I am merely seeking information. I want to be sure that no advantages are taken of the Senator from Oregon during his absence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Vermont is only seeking information.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate, and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED IN POLK COUNTY, IOWA, TO THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 223, S. 148.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 148) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 2, line 8, after the word "used," to strike out "primarily", and on page 3, line 15, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "Provided, That the improvements on such lands which are now being used by the State of Iowa for other than military purposes may continue to be used for such purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the utilization of such lands for military purposes.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Iowa all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the Camp Dodge Military Reservation, located in Polk County, Iowa, comprising 1,848.32 acres, more or less, and Polk County target range, Iowa, comprising 742.34 acres, more or less, both together with all buildings and improvements thereon, and all appurtenances, easements, rights-of-way, and utilities belonging or appurtenant thereto.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Iowa during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such national emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such national emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appurtenant thereto.

SEC. 5. In consideration for the conveyance of the lands described in the first section of this act, the State of Iowa shall agree to use for military purposes only and not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain lands (hereinafter called State lands) and improvements thereon which are owned by the State of Iowa and are used for National Guard purposes in connection with Camp Dodge and Polk County

Target Range as of the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the improvements on such lands which are now being used by the State of Iowa for other than military purposes may continue to be used for such purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the utilization of such lands for military purposes. The State of Iowa further agrees that it will, prior to delivery of the conveyance authorized herein, file with the Office of the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Farm Credit Building, 206 South 19th Street, Omaha, Nebr., a description of and inventory of the State-owned property as defined herein. In the event that the State of Iowa at any time shall breach the agreement defined in this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the property conveyed to the State of Iowa by the United States under the provisions of this act shall revert to the United States without cost. The State shall further agree that in the event that the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, the use of the State lands and improvements thereon, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense, be used by the United States during such emergency without cost to the United States.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

SEC. 7. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Iowa.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this act and any related documents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the bill and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, after the word "made", it is proposed to strike out "by the State of Iowa during its occupancy" and insert in lieu thereof "during its occupancy by the State of Iowa."

On page 3, line 1, after the word "on", it is proposed to insert "during its occupancy."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range, to the State of Iowa."

CONVEYANCE OF JACKSON BAR-RACKS, LA., TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to

the consideration of Calendar No. 224, S. 653.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 653) to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, after line 4, to strike out "interest of the United States in and to the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, being one hundred forty-five and twelve one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, in Orleans" and insert in lieu thereof "interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease numbered W-766-QM-6117 and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate one hundred four and six one-hundredths acres, more or less, in Orleans"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "training and support of the National Guard of Louisiana" and insert "training of the National Guard of Louisiana and for other military purposes"; and in line 12, after the word "national", to strike out "emergency, and such other reservations, restrictions, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States" and insert "emergency; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Louisiana all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease No. W-766-QM-6117, and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate 104.06 acres, more or less, in Orleans and St. Bernard Parishes, La., together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, the property to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana and for other military purposes, and the conveyance to be made without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the reservation by the United States of all mineral rights, including oil and gas; the right of reentry and use by the United States in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States.

SEC. 2. The costs of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance au-

thorized herein shall be borne by the State of Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.
Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I do not have a copy of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], together with his colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] is the author of the bill. It is similar to the two bills previously passed today. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services. It authorizes the conveyance of certain land to the State of Louisiana, to be used for National Guard purposes.

Mr. THYE. The land would be transferred for the exclusive use of the National Guard, in its training activities. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. The bill also provides that, in case of emergency, the property will revert to the Federal Government.

Mr. THYE. How many acres of land are involved?

Mr. LONG. Sixty-six and one-half acres.

Mr. THYE. As I understand, it has been a Federal reservation for many years.

Mr. LONG. The State of Louisiana has used the property for many years under a long-term Federal lease. The State has always used the property during peacetime for National Guard purposes, and the lease has always contained a recapture clause, which would become effective in the event of war or other emergency. Almost all the improvements on the property have been constructed by the National Guard of Louisiana. The bill is in accord with the general understanding that exists with respect to similar installations used by the National Guard.

Mr. THYE. The Senator has explained the bill sufficiently for my purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 19, after the word "States", it is proposed to insert a comma and "and in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Louisiana shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 225, Senate bill 933.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 933) to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senate bill 933 has to do with military compensation due a member of the armed services between the time he was last paid and the date of his death. The committee heard testimony from representatives of the General Accounting Office and from the Department of Defense, and they strongly support the bill and say it should be passed in the interest of economy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Armed Services were on page 2, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "the United States" and insert "the uniformed service of which the decedent was a member"; on page 3, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Amounts payable under this act shall be paid by the Department or uniformed service concerned or upon settlement by the General Accounting Office as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation authorize and direct and any payment made under this act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of any amount so paid.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 3. Subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, amounts payable to beneficiaries designated by the member under section 2 of this act shall be paid by the Department or uniformed service concerned. All other payments under this act shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office. Any payment made under this act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of any amount so paid.

On page 4, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The payment provisions of this act shall be effective only in cases wherein the member's death occurs on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month in which this act is enacted and the following statutory provisions shall have no application in such cases.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 5. The payment provisions of this act shall be effective only in cases wherein the member's death occurs on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month in which this act is enacted. The following

statutory provisions are repealed as of the effective date of the payment provisions of this act except with respect to the deaths of members occurring prior to such effective date.

And on page 5, after line 15, to strike out:

Sec. 6. The Departments shall take such action as is deemed necessary to notify members of the provisions of this act and of their rights to designate beneficiaries hereunder.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of this act the term "Department" shall mean the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, and the terms "uniformed services," "member" and "Secretary" shall have the respective meanings given those terms in section 102 of the Career Compensation act of 1949 (63 Stat. 804), as amended, on the date of enactment of this act, except that "the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" shall be substituted for "the Federal Security Administrator" in the definition of the term "Secretary."

Sec. 2. In the settlement of the account of any deceased member of the uniformed services or of the National Guard or the Air National Guard, the amount found due therein from the uniformed service of which the decedent was a member shall be paid to the person or persons surviving at the date of death in the following order of precedence:

First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries named to receive any such amount in a written designation executed by the member and received, prior to his death, in the place designated for such purpose in the regulations of the Department concerned;

Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of such member;

Third, if there be no beneficiary or surviving spouse, to the child or children of such member, and descendants of deceased children, by representation;

Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of the member, or the survivor of them; and

Fifth, if there be none of the above, to the duly appointed legal representative of the estate of the deceased member, or if there be none, to the person or persons determined to be entitled thereto under the laws of the domicile of the deceased member.

Sec. 3. Subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, amounts payable to beneficiaries designated by the member under section 2 of this act shall be paid by the Department or uniformed service concerned. All other payments under this act shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office. Any payment made under this act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of any amount so paid.

Sec. 4. Designations of beneficiary under this act, and changes therein, shall be made under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries concerned, and such regulations shall be uniform for all services insofar as practicable: *Provided*, That any designation of beneficiary made for the purposes of any 6 months' death gratuity (including any designation of a person whose right to the gratuity would not depend upon such designation) and heretofore or hereafter received in the Department concerned before the effective date of the payment provisions of this act shall be considered as a designation of beneficiary for the purposes of this act, in the absence of a designation of beneficiary under this act, unless the member making

the designation shall have been missing, missing in action, in the hands of a hostile force, or interned in a foreign country during any part of the period between the date of enactment of this act and the effective date thereof as prescribed in section 5 of this act.

Sec. 5. The payment provisions of this act shall be effective only in cases wherein the member's death occurs on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month in which this act is enacted. The following statutory provisions are repealed as of the effective date of the payment provisions of this act, except with respect to the deaths of members occurring prior to such effective date:

(1) The paragraph of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 750), which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, as amended by the act of December 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 795), and section 4 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30, 10 U. S. C. 868).

(2) Section 1 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30), as amended by section 18 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 560, 34 U. S. C. 941a).

(3) The paragraph in section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 531), which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted persons of the Coast Guard (14 U. S. C. 466).

(4) Section 507 of the Public Health Service Act, approved July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 711), as amended by section 2 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30, 42 U. S. C. 225).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 226, Senate bill 1094.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114), is amended by striking from the first sentence thereof the words "existing on the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to the bill which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

S. 1094 is a technical amendment to the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act

approved September 1, 1954. Enactment is necessary in order for the act to be administered in a consistent and equitable manner.

Serious inequities will occur under existing provisions that limit eligibility for the allowance to employees who were required by regulations "existing on the date of enactment" of the act to wear a prescribed uniform. It has been found that many employees wear uniforms solely as a matter of custom, so would not be eligible for the uniform allowance under the restrictive language of the act. S. 1094 would make the benefits potentially available to employees who are required by regulation or law, to wear a uniform. I am confident Congress intended this to be the result when it enacted the Uniform Allowance Act last fall, and therefore I believe there should be no objection to S. 1094 as proposed.

Enactment of S. 1094 will add no cost to the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954 because the cost of the uniforms herein authorized were included in the estimated cost of that act.

RELEASE OF THE REVERSIONARY RIGHTS IN A CERTAIN TRACT OF LAND TO THE VINELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 223, House Joint Resolution 107.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 367⁵⁹/₁₀₀₀-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDY MADE BY THE STAFF OF THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few moments regarding something which occurred yesterday. I have various news reports of yesterday's White House press conference. I hold in my hand an item from the Washington Post and Times Herald headed "Ike Flays GOP Book Blunder."

I have another from the Washington Star, headed "Eisenhower Calls GOP Pamphlet Security Error."

I have another from the New York Herald Tribune, headed "Eisenhower Hits Arms Data Leak—Sees Blunder by Republicans."

I have another one which appeared in the New York Times, giving a detailed report of the press conference, but I do not happen to have the headline.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator read the New York Times report carefully?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall.

Mr. AIKEN. I think he will find that the President does not blame the Senator from New Hampshire for the blunder; he blames those who have been leaking information from the Department of Defense for the past 2 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. The President's reference to the national-defense study made by the staff of the Republican policy committee as a blunder is most unfortunate.

The President's opinion might possibly be explained by his statement that our defense study was called to his attention on the way to the press conference by an aide. The President said:

They (his aides) made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred.

If the President's aides gave him such an opinion, then I say they are very much misinformed.

I offer the flat statement here and now that there is not a single piece of classified information in this defense study. Every item dealing with weapons was carefully cleared with Defense Department officials with whom we conferred and was expressly declared by them to be unclassified. We stated directly that we did not ask for any classified material.

Moreover, practically all of our material dealing with weapons has appeared in public print in newspapers, magazines, service journals, aircraft yearbooks, and other periodicals available to all the public.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the purport of the Senator's remarks, if a blunder was made, it was not made by the minority policy committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. The purport of my remarks is to show that the compilation made by the committee was devised in order to give the American people, Senators, and others, a fair understanding of our defense position, and the information it contained was entirely unclassified. I feel just as strongly about classified material leaking as does anyone else. I have cautioned against it. I have condemned it. I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee, or its predecessor the Military Affairs Committee, for almost 19 years. I have been on the Appropriations Committee and on the Armed Services subcommittee or its predecessor subcommittee of that committee for almost 19 years. I believe I am the only Senator in the Senate today who was among the first four Senators who were approached by President Roosevelt and, in turn, by Secretary Stimson, in connection with providing money to develop the atom bomb, which was the best kept secret in America. I look askance upon anyone who leaks classified material. There is no one who could deplore it more than I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with everything the Senator from New Hampshire has said about his service in

the Senate and about his high regard for classified information. Is my understanding of the Senator's statement correct that if a blunder was made, it was not made by the Senator's policy committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. It was not made by the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. I assume, from a reading of the verbatim transcript of the statement that it was made by the President's aides who gave him the information, because the President's sole information on the matter apparently came from his aides.

I wish to give an example. One of the subjects the policy committee booklet discussed was the Nike. This is what our report said about the Nike:

Surface-to-air guided missile used by the Army for antiaircraft defense.

Let us hear what someone else had published months earlier. The U. S. News & World Report of March 11, 1955, said of the Nike:

Seeks out approaching enemy aircraft by radar long before the aircraft can reach target city. Launching sites now being installed around major United States cities, with missiles in "quantity production" at this time.

This is what Newsweek said about the Nike on February 21, 1955:

The Army's sensational rocket-propelled antiaircraft guided missile: Traveling at supersonic speed, "Nike" tracks down, outmaneuvers, and can hit enemy planes 30 miles from its launching platform. Now being installed around United States cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full at this point in my remarks this example of comparisons between material printed in the policy committee booklet and material printed in publications of general circulation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NIKES

What policy committee booklet says:

The Nike: "Surface-to-air guided missile used by the Army for antiaircraft defense."

What U. S. News & World Report says March 11, 1955:

The Nike: "Seeks out approaching enemy aircraft by radar long before the aircraft can reach target city. Launching sites now being installed around major United States cities, with missiles in quantity production at this time."

What Newsweek says February 21, 1955:

The Nike: "The Army's sensational rocket-propelled antiaircraft guided missile. Traveling at supersonic speed, 'Nike' tracks down, outmaneuvers, and can hit enemy planes 30 miles from its launching platform. Now being installed around United States cities."

What Newsweek says January 3, 1955:

The Nike: "The Army's supersonic Nike antiaircraft missiles (range 20 miles, speed up to 1,600 miles per hour) are being stockpiled here in impressive quantity for instant shipment to key United States cities in the event of enemy air attack. Meanwhile, the Army is coming along fast with a new-model Nike with a range of 50 miles."

What Newsweek says February 28, 1955:

The Nike: "It's not generally realized how fast guided-missile and antiaircraft batteries are springing up around the United States. Between 14 and 15 major cities will be protected within a short time by 78 mis-

sile 'nests.' Next in line is a series of Nike bases to protect strategic points in Alaska."

What the 1954 Aircraft Year Book says:

Caption over picture of the Nike: "Here at home, the Department of Defense announced the Douglas Nike has been deployed as a first line of defense in case of air attack."

"Typical was the Douglas Nike, a pencil-shaped missile named for the famous Winged Victory of Greek mythology, and capable of intercepting and destroying enemy aircraft regardless of evasive action (p. 196)."

"Nike is a two-stage rocket classified as a surface-to-air weapon. It is a dart-like rocket with sharply swept cruciform fins near the nose and similar fins near the after end. It is about 20 feet long and 1 foot in diameter."

"The missile is attached to a booster section which also has stabilizing fins at the base. After a period of initial thrust which attains supersonic speed, the booster portion drops off and a sustaining rocket motor takes over."

"An explosive warhead and electronic guidance equipment also are carried in the body of the basic missile. As a safety measure, the warhead is designed to explode only when in flight."

"The rocket is an integral part of a complex spotting and guidance system which electronically picks up and tracks a target plane and automatically launches a rocket at the proper moment to intercept aircraft."

"Essentially, a defensive weapon, the Nike system provides strategic areas of the United States with a far greater degree of antiaircraft protection than was possible with the more limited ranges and altitudes reached by conventional antiaircraft guns."

"The missile operates effectively regardless of weather conditions or visibility."

"Nike may be employed either from fixed or mobile battery installations. All of its units, except steel launching racks, are housed in all-weather van-type trailers, also designed by Douglas. The entire system is designed to be transportable by air."

"Should enemy aircraft approach a strategic area defended by the Nike system, this would be the sequence of events:

"1. A Nike battery receives information that hostile aircraft are approaching, and radar follows the target automatically."

"2. Nike missiles are readied in vertical position on their launching racks."

"3. Radar provides a running account of the target's changing position."

"4. When the target crosses Nike's distant and invisible deadline, the missile is fired."

"5. Within seconds, it closes in on the airplane."

"6. When it reaches the target, the warhead explodes and destroys the plane (pp. 197-198)."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have in my hand material which contains most important defense information, but which was published in U. S. News & World Report, Newsweek, and various other magazines. Every item in our report has been either declassified by the Department of Defense or has been in print time after time previously. I do not think some of it should have been released originally, but it has been released and used. There is not a single classified item in our whole pamphlet.

For instance, I have before me the United States Aircraft Yearbook for 1954, which contains a chapter on guided missiles. The text of the chapter not only describes in general what such missiles are, but also contains pictures and intimate details of the engines.

Mr. President, this material has been published in newspapers and periodicals

in the United States, and it has been reported over the radio and on the television in its most intimate details. The report which the Republican policy committee has developed has assembled declassified and other material much of which has been in print time after time. In most instances what is contained in the policy committee's booklet is in very much less detail than has been referred to previously.

The Defense Department examined this study with a fine tooth comb a few days ago. It found that there were only three slight items which have been subjects of speculative writing and published in technical magazines. Even these were given to our staff by the Defense Department in the course of our original research. After reviewing our study carefully the Defense Department declared:

As the document contains no significant technical information about new weapons, the compilation of the material is not considered a breach of security.

The Defense Department then concluded that—

In fact, as a whole, this document presents many of the positive accomplishments and goals of the Department of Defense, and should be reassuring to the American people.

This is precisely the reason the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee undertook this study. It was to give a rounded picture of American defense policies and programs as developed by the Eisenhower administration and the Defense Department. For months political critics have been charging the administration with weakening national defense. Newspaper editors were protesting what they called suppression of legitimate news by the Defense Department. And the American people were becoming deeply concerned about our defense in these critical times of tension in foreign affairs.

So long as our defense policies and program remained vague, such criticisms and confusion could arise. Our staff undertook our study to meet these criticisms which in the light of the facts were unjustified and to dispel public confusion.

We believe we have made a valuable contribution to a better understanding of the administration's program. We have equipped our Senators to inform the public accurately. If the President's aides gave him a different impression of our study than appears in the above facts, they have grossly misinformed him.

Mr. President, I desire to read a letter written by Robert Tripp Ross, Assistant Secretary of Defense, to Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, under date of April 26, 1955. The letter is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1955.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Reference is made to the memorandum from Special Counsel John J. Courtney to Col. Wade M. Fleischer, Director of Legislative Liaison, dated April 25, 1955, concerning an article published in the Wash-

ington Evening Star on April 23 relative to the pamphlet, National Defense Under the Republican Administration—Today and Tomorrow.

As the document contains no significant technical information about new weapons, the compilation of the material is not considered a breach of security.

The Chief Security Review Officer, Department of Defense, has reported to me that a security review of the material has been completed, and reveals only three minor technical items associated with projects which had not heretofore been cleared for open publication or general dissemination. The mention, however, of the names of these projects does not in itself constitute any revelation of information which would be of aid to a potential enemy, nor does it amount to a security violation.

Most of the factual information contained in the pamphlet was taken from unclassified documents furnished the Senate Republican policy committee by, and cleared for publication by, the Department of Defense. In addition, the three items referred to in the preceding paragraph have been subjects of speculative writing and published in technical magazines.

The security-violations information in the Star article is not correct and was obviously obtained from some unauthorized and as yet unidentified source before the review of the document had been completed.

In fact, as a whole, this document presents many of the positive accomplishments and goals of the Department of Defense and should be reassuring to the American people.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for bringing up the point which he has made. I simply wish to say that what I object to, as chairman of the Republican policy committee, is the inference that the committee would give out any classified information.

Obviously, the President had not read the booklet, had not seen it, and depended upon his aides for information, and they gave him wrong information.

I know what classified information is. I know what secret information is. I have been around Washington about as long as anyone else who is concerned with these matters, whether he be in the Department of Defense or in the United States Senate. I have handled all kinds of secret documents, and I would be the last one to be a party to publishing anything which I thought was classified.

However, after I have seen material published time after time in the press, and when I have checked with the Department of Defense to determine whether other material has been officially declassified, I think that the policy committee and its chairman proceeded correctly in publishing such information.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would object to having printed at the end of the discussion the text of the verbatim remarks of the President as published in the New York Times this morning. If one reads them carefully, he will see that the President was not accusing the Senator from New Hampshire and the Republican

policy committee of the blunder. He is quoted as saying:

I heard about this pamphlet just before I came over. They gave me some idea that made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred.

Now, for the past 2 years—I say "a blunder," somebody, I think was—gave out information that I wouldn't have given out, at least.

The President did not accuse the Republican policy committee of giving out the information. He accused someone of making a blunder by giving out information during the past 2 years, which, to quote the President, he "wouldn't have given out, at least."

If the President had been in Washington at the time he was in Europe during the war and after the war, he would have found that much information had been given out of the type which might be considered secret information, and that this is not something which has occurred only in the past 2 years.

I have been here almost 15 years, and I have heard given every year on the floor of the Senate information which I would have considered as something that should have been classified, or, at least, not widely publicized. That is why I should like to have the verbatim statement of the President printed in the RECORD, because from reading it one cannot get the inference that he accused the policy committee, but that he criticized the leaking confidential information out of the Pentagon, I suppose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. AIKEN. It is unfortunate, I say to the President and to the Senator from New Hampshire, that some of the newspapers saw fit so to write up the subject as to make it appear that the President was attacking the Republican policy committee. Of course, that will help sell more newspapers tomorrow. We understand newspapers thrive on controversy; and controversies being lacking, controversies can always be provided.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

EXHIBIT 1

SECRECY POLICY DISCUSSED

Mr. DRUMMOND. Mr. President, may I ask a brief question about this matter of making military information easy or too easy for an enemy to get?

May I ask whether you feel entirely relaxed about the pamphlet issued by the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate detailing information about new weapons and related military information?

Answer. I heard about this pamphlet just before I came over. They gave me some idea that made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred.

Now, for the past 2 years—I say "a blunder," somebody, I think, was—gave out information that I wouldn't have given out, at least.

For some 2 years and 3 months I have been plagued by inexplicable, undiscovered leaks in this Government. But we mustn't be too astonished when we recognize that great numbers of people in this town who necessarily know details of one kind or another.

I just don't believe that it is justifiable for any governmental official to release anything that applies to the secret war plans, war policies, war purposes, and war equipment of this Government. That is the kind of thing that foreign intelligence systems spend thousands and thousands of dollars to get, unless we give it to them for nothing. And since we don't get it for nothing, I just don't believe in that kind of a trade. [Laughter.]

Now, this is what I believe in giving away: I think today to hold secret any document of the World War, including my own mistakes, except only when they are held there by some past agreement with a foreign nation that has not yet been abrogated, it is foolish.

Everything ought to be given out that helps the public of the United States to profit from past mistakes, to make decisions of the moment; that is current information.

But this is one thing I say it doesn't help any of us to make a decision merely to know that a plane can fly 802 miles instead of 208. That is a secret we should not be giving out. And that is the kind of thing I am talking about, and that only, I assure you.

Mr. CUTTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSFER OF PEOPLES OR TERRITORY TO COMMUNIST CONTROL BY CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICIALS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas President Eisenhower stated on January 6, 1955:

"It is of the utmost importance that each of us understand the true nature of the struggle now taking place in the world.

"It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. At issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the Psalmist described as 'a little lower than the angels,' crowned with glory and honor, holding 'dominion over the works' of his Creator; or man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

"It is, therefore, struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny. This prize, so precious, so fraught with ultimate meaning, is the true object of the contending forces in the world. * * *

"The massive military machines and ambitions of the Soviet-Communist bloc still create uneasiness in the world. All of us are aware of the continuing reliance of the Soviet Communists on military force, of the power of their weapons, of their present resistance to realistic armament limitation, and of their continuing effort to dominate or intimidate free nations on their periphery. Their steadily growing power includes an increasing strength in nuclear weapons. This power, combined with the proclaimed intentions of the Communist leaders to communize the world, is the threat confronting us today"; and

Whereas President Truman said, on March 12, 1947, in announcing the program for Greek-Turkish aid:

"One way of life is based on the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

"The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the area and power of military dictatorships shall not be permitted to expand; and it is essential to the honor of the American people that no part of any population now free shall be subjected to totalitarian slavery: Therefore be it

Resolved, That (a) no official or employee of the Government of the United States, or member of its armed services, may take part in any conference, or in steps leading to any conference, or in any commitment, open or secret, which has for its purpose or effect the transfer of any territory to the control of a Communist police state, or the transfer of any people or any part of the population of any nation to Communist enslavement.

(b) No such agreement or commitment shall be binding upon the United States.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at this particular time in history, will give consideration to this important resolution. I also hope that, relying upon quotations from statements by President Eisenhower and President Truman, we, as a nation, and our leaders, mean what we say and say what we mean.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NO MORE YALTA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the air is, and for the past several days has been, full of foreboding that a carefully laid plan is under way for the United States to give up, bit by bit, its commitments in the Formosa Strait.

We sense that the decisive moment is close at hand.

Since the passage of the Formosa resolution by a nearly unanimous vote, the policy embodied in that resolution, of drawing a line which the Red Chinese armed forces were not to cross, has been undermined by a series of seemingly simple, but really very skillful steps to remove the props on which it rests.

The appeasers are cleverly trying to change the Formosa resolution from a courageous stand on the world conflict with communism, to a minor difference of opinion about a few little islands off the coast of Asia.

This planned shrinkage of a major world crisis to a minor border clash is back of the proposals to ask for a ceasefire, to send to the United Nations the question of setting up two Chinas, to hold a plebiscite, and to ask our allies to help guard Formosa.

Every one of these proposals was designed to belittle the Formosa question, and to induce us to consent to surrender by implying we were debating a minor adjustment involving no decisive issue.

The issue in the Formosa strait is not a few islands. Formosa is an outpost on the boundary line which protects the free world. This line marks the limits behind which those who oppose communism are safe. If the line breaks at Formosa, the whole free world will be imperiled, and in retreat.

All the Asian nations which live on the borders of the Soviet empire—Japan, the Philippines, southeast Asia, and Pakistan—know their security is in peril.

All the frontier nations in Europe read the warnings the same way.

Surrender at Quemoy will shake Germany to its foundations, tell Austria it has no hope, warn Italy it is now on the crumbling frontier, tell France it is the next victim.

As our minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] said at Indianapolis, only a few days ago, Quemoy and Matsu are outposts as important as the island of Berlin.

When the Communists attempted to blockade Berlin, why did we resist? Berlin is only a city, an island surrounded by enemy territory. Why did we not retreat? We did not retreat because a retreat from Berlin would have endangered the entire frontier of freedom in the West. Retreat would have weakened the morale of our supporters behind the Iron Curtain and in the line of fire.

How absurd to judge the importance of a battle by the size of the battlefield. Bunker Hill was only a hillock. Valley Forge was only an encampment, Mr. President. Thermopylae was only a mountain pass. They were portentous because two worlds, two ways of thinking, faced each other in mortal combat; and the issue was victory or death.

Mr. President, I would that every Member of the Senate could have heard the testimony, this morning, of General Frank Howley, in his appearance before the Internal Security Committee. He is a man who, as military commander of Berlin, has dealt for 4½ years with the Communist tactics. He has made a first-hand study of what it is all about.

Mr. President, what is the matter with our leaders? What is the matter with the Senate? Do we not yet know what it is all about?

If surrendering a few islands will avoid a world war, why not surrender Hong Kong to Red China? Why not surrender Berlin to East Germany? Why not give Denmark to the Soviet Union? It will ease her tension for the moment.

But if we start to retreat at Quemoy, where do we end our abject surrender? Americans are on the side of free China, because free China shares our belief in the dignity of man. Free China has been fighting since 1927 to hold back the onslaught of the modern Genghis Khan. We have pledged our word to free China again and again.

Only a few weeks ago our Navy was assigned to help in removing the pitiful inhabitants of the Tachen Islands, whose families had lived for centuries on their rocky fields.

We were told the move was necessary in order to straighten the line that marked our outposts. If that was not a commitment to help guard the corrected line, including Quemoy and Matsu, I do not know what a commitment is.

Since the end of the Second World War, the Communists have started three wars against legally established governments in Asia—first, against Nationalist China; second, against the Republic of Korea. In the third war, against Indo-

China, their legions were moved from North Korea to South China. They helped seize half of Viet-Nam, and enslaved millions of human souls.

Now they boast of plans for a fourth war in Asia, and we know the fourth war will not be the last.

They still hold our American prisoners of war in common jails, in spite of their specific agreement, in the cease-fire settlement, to return all prisoners of war.

Furthermore, they hold hundreds of other prisoners illegally. Yet, Mr. President, at this time we are willing to sit down at a table to negotiate with known bandits, gangsters, and murderers. Those who are discussing that proposal have not even laid down any conditions to the effect that the criminals in the Korean war should pay the price that the German criminals paid, following World War II.

Mr. President, have you seen any of them punished for illegally murdering American soldiers? Have such atrocities been called to the attention of the world? Have there been trials, as a result of the Korean war? No. On what grounds does anyone dare ask America to appease these bandits?

The United States has been slow to use its power in every crisis in Asia.

Like Gulliver in Lilliput, the great strength of the United States has been pinned down by men too small for it to notice.

I will not go into the question of who is responsible.

This is a time for Americans to agree insofar as they can find agreement.

Our problem today is to make sure our strength will not be pinned down again if the Communists start a fourth war in Asia.

We must find a way to lock the stable, before the horse is stolen.

We must have a formula to prevent surrender or appeasement; and that formula must be so clear, so simple, so self-executing, that no hidden appeasers can pervert it. That is what will be done by means of the resolution I have submitted, Mr. President.

I submit the resolution to that end. It follows closely statements of policy made by President Eisenhower, President Truman, and many other distinguished American leaders. It rests on the belief that the Communists will never stop their militant aggression until our country is destroyed. It rests on the belief that there is a moral difference between Soviet philosophy and that of the free nations—not only a political difference or an economic difference but a difference in the meaning of promises and agreements and truth, a difference in the way human life is to be valued. We compromise on such issues at our peril.

It follows, I believe, that in our national interest we cannot surrender a single square foot of free land to Communist rule, so long as that rule is inhuman tyranny. We cannot morally subject a single freeman to Communist rule so long as that rule is human slavery.

Mr. President, my proposal is simple. I propose that no official of our civil or Military Establishment shall participate,

in any way, in any act which has the purpose or effect of surrendering either territory or people now part of the free world.

I propose that if any American official does participate in any such agreement, his acts shall not be binding on the Government and the people of the United States.

Any American official who attempts to negotiate another Yalta agreement will be on notice that he cannot commit the United States.

Any nation which attempts to inveigle our officials into another Yalta agreement will be on notice that it can gain nothing.

There is no aggression here, Mr. President. This is a purely defensive resolution. We seek no territory. We threaten no part of the Communist empire. We want no war.

Our only purpose is to prevent another sell-out, of free lands and free people, to the Communists.

Members of Congress have spent years, Mr. President, trying to get the true record of Yalta, where our representatives surrendered central Europe and north China to the Soviet Union and sent millions of human beings to death or hideous slavery.

We shall spend more years trying to get the record of Teheran and Potsdam.

When we shall have finished we shall not have touched the secret agreements, the hidden deals. We shall not have remedied one iota of the damage.

I, for one, am tired of trying to undo the past. I want to prevent new damage. I want a rule of policy so simple and clear that there can be no more Yaltas.

I offer that rule here today—a binding commitment by the Congress that no American official can surrender any more land or people to the Communists, or if he attempts to do so, he can not bind the United States.

I want to make it useless for any official to promise appeasement.

Our honor and our self-interest are one in this matter. Both honor and self-interest forbid us to make deals or sell out to a totalitarian empire armed with guns made by human slavery, enforced by the firing squad.

We know where the American people stand. Surely there is enough political skill in the Congress to make sure none of our officials take a path contrary to what our people wish.

Let this be the beginning, Mr. President, of an unshakeable American policy. Let it be the end of surrendering lands or people to slavery. Let it be the basis of a true and honest promise that the United States has put appeasement and double-talk behind her.

One-third of the world is, alas, now under the dark cloud of slavery. Let us make certain that America shall never again consent to surrender any lands or people, now free, to that darkness.

Once we draw a firm line, and cut off the ability of the Communist nations to such sustenance from countries now outside the Iron Curtain, I am confident that the robber states of communism will wither away, and true peace will come again to a weary world.

UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since 1944, 31 Negro colleges in the country have been aided from funds raised by the United Negro College Fund drive, which takes place annually. This year the campaign will be held during the first week in May, and I commend the appeal to our people.

The funds so derived are devoted to Negro scholarships, improved teaching facilities, health programs, library facilities, and other constructive and useful purposes.

The 16 million Negroes in the Nation constitute about 10 percent of the population. Yet of the 2½ million students enrolled in colleges and universities, only 4 percent are Negroes. Here is a gap that can be filled in large measure by aiding the Negro colleges who share in the united fund. More and more Negro students are seeking a college education, but their hopes can be realized only if the facilities are available.

The goal of the drive is \$175 million. This represents the 10-percent gap between the needs of these colleges and what they expect to derive from tuition and endowments. It is a modest sum. The total budget of all 31 colleges is less than that of the budgets for some of our single universities. This sobering fact portrays the need. For such a worthy cause, I am sure the people of the country will respond.

AIRPOWER AS OUR NATIONAL STRATEGY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, throughout our entire history our national and international policy has been and still is one of peace, and because of that our people have looked upon war with repugnance and distaste. We as a people have never understood war nor what war is supposed to accomplish. War used to be something remotely connected with our daily domestic problems, but modern war means total war. Admiral Mahan said:

It behoves countries whose people, like all free peoples, object to paying for large military establishments, to see to it that they are at least strong enough to gain the time to turn the spirit and capacity of their subjects into the new activities which war calls for.

In modern war there is every possibility that there will not be time to accomplish the objective outlined by Admiral Mahan, so we must turn our attention to the problems of war in times of peace, realizing that, should we ever have to become engaged in war, the strength that Mahan speaks of will be with us immediately.

It is with that in mind that I approach my subject, hoping during the discourse to throw some light upon the general nature of war and upon the position which we in the United States find ourselves at this period of history.

War is but an instrument of policy, of international policy. We have other instruments we use to accomplish our policies; one is psychological, another economic, still another political. It has been possible in our history to avert the

use of the last-resort instrument, war, by the proper utilization of some or all of these other instruments. However, in this modern day we find ourselves in an entirely different position than that at any other time in our history. We know who our enemy is and what his intentions are. We know our enemy to be Bolshevik communism, and his intentions to be the substitution of his philosophy of government for those of the free countries of the world. His philosophy of government is tyranny, ours and our allies, freedom. Our differences, we know, are not based primarily on economics nor upon the needs for geographic expansion, so we can, therefore, confine the issue as being one of completely opposite political philosophies. We can direct our policy of peace and freedom toward the conquering of this issue of communism. In directing our efforts toward the furthering of our policy to the end that all of the peoples of the world may be free, we will pursue psychological methods and economic and political efforts, but at the same time we must be realistic in our approach to this problem by recognizing that when there are two philosophies existent in the world, and they are diametrically opposite; there is always the possibility that war might have to be the instrument we ultimately use to insure the furtherance of our own policy. Recognizing this, it is well that we as a nation understand the position that we are in today as leaders of the free world, and how through the evolution of transportation and weapons we arrived there.

In the past it has been the professional soldier who has always been reluctant to give up his old weapon for the new or to give up old strategy for the new. Now we must be concerned not only with the attitude of the professional soldier, but also with the attitude of our citizenry as a whole, whom we now ask to understand more fully problems which heretofore the citizens considered as the sole property of the military. I feel that it is necessary in developing a discussion of this nature to go back briefly through history to demonstrate how power has developed throughout the centuries and why power has rested for brief moments in the hands of various nations.

Last year, during a speech on the floor of the Senate I discussed the development of transportation and the attendant tenure of world power in those countries which mastered transportation. I should like to repeat at this time a portion of what I then said:

Civilization began in the river valleys of Asia. Men assembled there in small villages and towns, and, almost at once, the desire to communicate with one another led to traffic up and down the rivers of that vast continent. Their transportation was confined to the rivers, however, because, when the tiny and primitive boats reached the mouths of the rivers, they were turned back by the heavy and awesome seas. Asia grew, then, within itself, its development being confined to the length and breadth of the valleys. Men did not dare to venture past these confines, and this restrictive influence of Asian geography is still reflected in the backwardness of the Asiatic countries. While it is true that their cultures flourished, the lack of contact with the

outside world brought about a narrowness and provincialism in their ranks which persists even to this day.

Turning next to Egypt and her great Nile River, we find that there men also assembled in towns along that river; but as they approached the mouth of this one, they found a small, quiet sea whose islands were easy points of recognition for navigation and whose nearly always placid waters offered no great obstacle to commerce between the countries which bordered upon it. Hence, great countries like Greece, Egypt, and the Roman Empire came into being. As the means of transportation gradually improved, commerce flourished, and these Mediterranean countries became the great powers of the then known world.

The ability which man acquired in the navigation of the Mediterranean made it only natural that he should venture even farther into the unknown vastness of the deep oceans. With the advent of deep-sea navigation and transportation, the countries whose harbors bordered on the Atlantic in Europe began to grow into world powers. In the logical course of such events, Spain and Portugal became the first of these countries to assume power through their mastery of the ocean. It followed, then, that little England, heretofore only an island kingdom, would assume world leadership through her inheritance and dominance of the seas. Through seapower, England became the master country of the world, not only politically but also economically, and it is interesting to note that until the advent and development of aviation she successfully retained that position, and, I might add, through its use, enjoyed a rather peaceful existence.

Before coming up to the present day to discuss the new transportation era in which we find ourselves, we should look briefly at the impact which the advent of the railroads made on the inland empires of the world. Until the railroad chugged across the American scene in the 1830's, the economic dominance was confined to those countries controlling the seas. The railroad, however, made it possible to develop our own country and it is probably the greatest single contributing factor to the economic growth of the United States outside our basic free-enterprise system.

The railroads opened up the power of Germany. Even Russia began to construct a railroad system, but fell short of its needs, and today much of the Soviet Union's backwardness, up until the air age, can be blamed on an inadequate railroad system. In China, likewise, we find a large interior country whose commerce has been stagnant because no proper means of inland transportation has been developed and maintained. The iron horse moved the people away from the rivers, across the plains and mountains, and interior countries began to compete on a more equal basis with the seaboard countries in the race for world power.

A new method of transportation came into prominence between the First and Second World Wars, however; and, since that time, it has risen in the extent of its impact upon the course of human affairs. Airpower has completely destroyed the transport barriers of yesterday, and today we live in a world whose wide and farflung points can be visited easily and quickly for business, pleasure, or, sadly and more significantly, for the purpose of war.

Having seen how power passes to those countries who master new and improved transportation systems, we are in a position to understand how the United States, with its superiority in technology and production, and with its long interest in air transportation stands dominant in that field today. We are, by that criterion, the leading world power.

It is necessary, though, that we explore another avenue of history so that we can relate the power of air transportation with the power of modern weapons before developing fully the role of the United States as the leader in the efforts for peace and to attempt to develop the role of airpower and air supremacy as a means of keeping the peace.

Mr. President, historians are pretty much in agreement that there have been 6 weapons systems developed for land warfare and 4 for sea warfare during the history of the struggle of men with each other. Looking first at the weapons systems developed for land use, we see that the horde army as used by the Genghis Khan and later by Alexander was the first of these. During the early period of history there was no change in this system. It was not until the year 500 B. C., when the Greeks introduced the phalanx, that a new system replaced the old one. Within 300 years, however, the Roman legion was able to defeat the phalanx and the legion became the weapons system used for the next 500 years. When the advantages of mobility became recognized as a military factor, cavalry came to dominate the scene for nearly a thousand years. With the invention of gunpowder, however, cavalry was replaced with unarmored, and more recently, armored and mechanized infantry.

While these military developments were taking place on land we find that on sea the first system which was used was the old galleys propelled by oars. The strategy involved in their use was to conduct a battle as nearly like a land battle as was possible. It was not until the battle of the Grand Armada, in 1588, that we saw naval warfare developing as we know it today. Even this system was improved with the advent of steam-driven and armor-plated ships. World War I introduced a new element in naval weapons systems. This was the submarine. To meet this new threat, naval tactics were drastically changed with the naval carrier task force becoming the striking force of the modern navy.

Mr. President, all of these various systems were developed for the sole purpose of controlling specific land or sea areas, and each was the result of an improvement in fire power. It is more interesting to note, however, that even with this evolution of weapons systems, strategies remained tied to the earth's surface.

The only thing that changed was the degree of power; one nation's field military force unleashed against another nation's army and navy. These forces used their national resources to wear down and destroy enemy forces. This destruction had only an indirect effect on national resources, and the outcome was determined by the degree to which the power of armies and fleets was eliminated.

I have devoted some time to outlining the development of weapons systems for two reasons. First, it shows us that man is an inventive being. Civilization is not static, and with each successive generation, improvements, both military and social, have been effected. My second reason for this summary, and to me the most important reason, is to show that

man is not and should not be necessarily restricted by what we call tradition.

We must be willing to take from the past only those things which will be useful today and tomorrow. We must not substitute precedent for the maximum use of those resources and realities that we are aware of today; the prejudices of history must be overcome.

The advent of the far-ranging airplane in our time has changed all the concepts of conflict which were developed from the time of man's birth to the start of the 20th century. Aerial operations have had a profound effect, not only upon the nature of land and sea conflict, but also on the daily relations of the nations of the world with one another. Both military and commercial air development shook the complacency of nations that hitherto had been able to isolate themselves from the cause and effects of international behavior. Land and sea barriers melted away, and it was as though the very soul of a nation became vulnerable to any and all peoples.

World War I demonstrated this offensive capacity of a nation and its ability to disregard those barriers designed by both man and nature. Aircraft with offensive speed and maneuverability, armament, and penetrating characteristics, gave all nations an ability to strike directly at all the resources, human and material, of a nation in their primary and raw form before they could be used for military purposes. Military operations were no longer restricted, for now we were able to go over and not through or around. Forces tied to land and surface strategies literally and figuratively looked up to this new weapon, for now they were vulnerable to attack from any and all directions.

From the time the first airplane was used as a weapon, military concepts and doctrines based on centuries of precedent became obsolete.

Airpower gave new meaning to such principles of war as economy, flexibility, security, surprise, and control. The factors that modified the courses of previous conflict became meaningless for the most part, since the nature of the medium of space gives to air forces a versatility never known to surface forces. Thus, just as Mahan recognized that the primary medium of power of a maritime nation was seapower, more recent events have pointed to airpower as the key to national strategy. Since it is the key, it must be the dominant force.

Now, having related the improvement in each new weapons system to firepower, we can place the modern weapons system in its proper perspective when viewed alongside of air transportation. Neither our present weapons system nor our means for transporting it are new. After the first daylight air raid on London in 1917 General Smuts said:

The day may not be far off when aerial operations, with their devastation of enemy lands and destruction of industrial and population centers on a vast scale may become the principal operations of war, to which the older forms of military and naval operations may become secondary and subordinate. Air supremacy may in the long run become as important a factor in the defense of the empire as sea supremacy.

How prophetic were those words of General Smuts in 1917. During World War II and the Korean conflict we found that both land and sea power remained, as before, extremely important to the pursuance of war. However, the forces required to exercise both of these powers had changed considerably in character. We found that air superiority was now the prime requisite to all operations of war whether they be on land, on the sea, or in the air. We found, too, that even to begin to wage a war required that our air arm be able completely to deny air operations to our enemy before our own operations could proceed. This is what we now call air superiority.

Mr. President, in order more fully to develop the role of air power in our national strategy, I must at this time revert again to history—to that portion of the history of transportation and the development of weapons systems that brought about sea power. Great Britain, it will be recalled, mastered ocean navigation and likewise mastered the weapons system of the sea when in 1588 she defeated Spain in the first modern naval battle. Great Britain continued to be dominant in this new field of transportation and to be dominant also in the utilization of this new weapons system. By the judicious use of both, she was able to maintain a peaceful situation for many years. With the coming of the air age, however, Great Britain no longer dominates the world as she did when sea power was her strength. The thesis of Admiral Mahan was now only valid as it applied to a new element—the air. Great Britain recognized this change; she accepted the fact that with this new dimension in the element of power, surface forces and surface strategies were vulnerable and obsolete. The Royal Air Force replaced the Royal Navy as the key to her military doctrine. History having overtaken the British Navy, that country's Air Force assumed the dominant role. The reasoning of Billy Mitchell now applied. Just as it once was necessary to bring matters to an issue upon the broad sea, it is now possible to resolve conflict only in the medium of the limitless skies.

Mr. President, it may be well now to examine our military policies to see how we can best bring matters to an issue in the vast expanse of the sky, and, by doing this, maintain peace throughout the world as England so successfully did when following the concept by the proper use of seapower. On January 12, 1954, Secretary of State Dulles made a speech which I feel was not thoroughly understood by the American people. It was entitled "The Evolution of Foreign Policy," and it became controversial because it stated that the President had made a decision to "depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing." What people failed to notice was the continuing statement:

Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our military establishment to fit what is our policy instead of having to try to meet the enemy's many choices.

In the past the enemy's many choices were reflected in such areas as Greece and Turkey, Berlin, Korea, and Indo-

china. In the past our actions have been emergency actions which while effective were inadequate because, as Mr. Dulles said:

What we did was, in the main, emergency action, imposed on us by our enemies.

One of the basic concepts of warfare as expressed by Clausewitz is that a defensive position is strongest particularly when the defense has strong means of retaliation. Following this concept, what Mr. Dulles' statement implied was that the United States had decided to "place more reliance on deterrent power and less dependence on local defensive power." Mr. Dulles went on to explain this by saying:

What the Eisenhower administration wants is a * * * international security system.

I see in that January 12, 1954 speech of Secretary Dulles' the first official recognition by any person in a position such as he occupies that airpower has replaced seapower and landpower as the dominant force for peace in the world. What Mr. Dulles said in effect replaces a Mahan theory for the seas with a Mitchell theory for air, in that air, having developed as the strongest means of transportation, and the United States being dominant in this field, we can well accept airpower as our national strategy and build around it the organizations of the land and sea forces.

Just as England, when she had control of the seas, maintained a highly mobile and effective sea force, so must we today maintain a highly mobile and increasingly effective Air Force. The truth of this doctrine cannot be doubted with the results of World War II and Korea freshly in our minds. We have seen that military operations on land and sea cannot proceed without air superiority. We know, too, that transportation can be denied on the surface of the seas and underneath the seas by airpower. We know, too, that land transportation can be completely destroyed by airpower. Knowing these things, we can generalize as follows:

Airpower is the national strategy which relies for force on a weapons system in which the land and sea forces are organized around the air forces.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to make it clear that I am not either advocating or opposing the cuts in the military budget as recommended by the Department of Defense. What I am now suggesting is a new national concept of airpower strategy which may be applied to our land and sea forces in the future, to the end that those forces will reflect their adequate strength as being dependent primarily upon the power of the Air Force.

This means that airpower becomes the primary manifestation of national power, in war and in peace, because of its direct influence upon the social structure and warmaking potential of an enemy nation. If we, as a people, are willing to accept the new doctrine that peace can be maintained through airpower, then we will not be like the professional soldier of old who was very reluctant to give up his particular weapon or his particular pet strategy. We will

become a people fully aware of the problems of war and a people determined to support this kind of an approach to peace, psychologically, industrially, politically, and in every other way incumbent on us. It will better enable us to understand the necessity of evaluating existing and contemplated weapons systems. This is not a question of subjugating one service at the expense of another. Rather it is a matter of obtaining the greatest possible return from our dollar investment in the military forces as a whole. Once this is done, the force requirements can be determined accordingly and phased to meet the time requirements of our strategy.

It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that nuclear weapons and modern delivery systems have become the cornerstone of modern military power. We all recognize it to be the key to American security. Military tasks, therefore, primarily consist of maintaining armaments in such a state of readiness and in such quantities that the Communists will find it disadvantageous to solve their problem by the use of nuclear weapons. They must not only be faced with an impossible task of neutralizing our retaliatory effort but must also be made to realize that should retaliation on our part be necessary, such an action will be instant and complete.

Unfortunately many in this country, both military and civilian, do not realize the full scope of these military responsibilities. These are the people whose thinking is clouded by historical prejudice. These are the proponents of "balanced forces," "supercarriers," duplications in military effort, conflicting service roles and missions. These are the wearers of the "old school tie" in a day and age when a new school has been founded.

It is not suggested that we do away completely with surface forces merely because we are in a nuclear age. It is difficult to understand, however, why many still do not see the need to tailor service needs and requirements to conform to modern patterns of political and military reality. This is not simply a question of money—although I believe that billions of dollars could be saved if forces were designed around service missions—but a recognition that nations control war, and therefore peace, by their dominance in modern weapons and the expeditious means to deliver them. We must accept the influence of powerful air forces upon international behavior. An understanding of the implications of this new weapon is not a matter of choice; it is the very condition of national survival.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am very sorry that I did not have the privilege of listening to the entire address just delivered by my able friend from Arizona. I heard a part of the speech, however, the other night, and I hope that my colleagues will give it very careful consideration.

Knowing some of the contents of the Senator's address, I should like to ask the Senator what attention he has given to the question of basic military training, as related to universal military training.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad that such an eminent military authority as the Senator from Pennsylvania has asked that question.

I feel that the United States must maintain a strong Reserve system. I do not believe that the rather pussy-footing bill, I may call it, which was passed by the House yesterday, is an approach to that end.

There can be military training in our high schools and colleges. There can be voluntary military training. It should be adequate; but I think it can be arranged so as to require a minimum of time from the boy who must take such training.

I feel that a strong reserve force in the United States will save the people of the Nation billions of dollars. But, more important, there will be an adequate reserve which can be called on immediately. It will not take 2, 3, or 4 years to train forces, as has been necessary in the past.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Speaking from the viewpoint of a young American, as compared with one of my age, does the Senator see any objection to a proposal to require every boy in the Nation to have some basic military training?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I feel that the boy not only owes it to his country to have basic military training, but he owes it to himself.

The eminent Senator from Pennsylvania served as a general in two World Wars. He knows from experience that the boys who get hurt are the boys who are quickly trained in boot camps, boys who are given 6 weeks of training in military camps, and who have not had much exposure to actual combat conditions. The boys who come home safely, 9 times out of 10, are members of the National Guard or the Reserves.

I can answer only by saying that my two boys will enter the military service and are already looking forward to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In part, my next question will be in the nature of a comment. Does the Senator from Arizona, based upon his experience with military affairs, know of any reason why there should not be a large permanent reserve of officers who are especially well trained in the American way of life and in military affairs, and who would be able to train civilian components, particularly the National Guard and the Organized Reserves?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That system is utilized at present. I do not know whether the present supply of officers is adequate or inadequate. But certainly those who are engaged in the task of training our young men should be skilled primarily in all things pertaining to the American way of life, especially economic and social systems, and

secondarily in the military strategy and weapons of this country.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield further, I should like to comment that in World War II, I trained a division, and I had as instructors quite a number of very fine Regular Army officers. I used all those officers in places of command. For example, the 109th Field Artillery was commanded by a Regular Army officer. The 112th Infantry was commanded by a Regular Army officer. My G-2, for example, was a Regular Army officer. They all worked magnificently together.

I am suggesting now that many of such officers could have permanent command in the National Guard and Reserve, and thereby themselves acquire additional training. Unfortunately, in our country general officers do not have sufficient opportunity to command troops in the field, commensurate with their own rank. Does the Senator see anything that would not be good, from an American standpoint, in giving such officers such opportunity?

Many persons feel that Regular Army officers do not have a full conception of what America means. I do not agree with them. Some of the finest advisers I have had, political and otherwise, have been officers of the Army.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator about the quality of Americanism found in our armed services. I do not think those men can be topped. I regret that some people, perhaps, do not look up to our military officers, and appreciate the training that has resulted in their holding their present positions.

To answer the first part of the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as the Senator knows, one would have to consider that there is a constant pressure of young officers who desire to move up. I think the Air Force has taken a wise tack in not waiting until officers are about ready to retire before giving them high rank, but in having their officers become generals at a young age, such as 40, 42, and 45, so that they can have 10, 12, or even 18 years of command under their belts, and be available should trouble arise.

However, to provide adequate space in the table of organizations in the Reserve and National Guard for officers who are no longer connected with active military service would probably present problems because of there not being a sufficient number of vacancies for those officers. The Senator knows what happens when there may be a full colonel or a general who is getting along in years, and a captain who is eager to advance, but who cannot be promoted because the "stars" keep him down.

If we should develop the Reserve program and Congress should provide adequate funds for pay, summer camp, and equipment, then I feel we could expand the program somewhat. Such a program would have to have help from the Federal Government, and moneys now directed to the Regular Military Establishment would have to be transferred to the Reserve Forces for arms, equipment, and pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much time. I wish to express my appreciation for having had an opportunity to hear a part of a very well prepared thesis respecting certain elements of our military forces. I am still old-fashioned enough to think that, in the finality, we will need ground forces.

One of the questions I am particularly interested in is rapid transportation. That is one of the reasons why I introduced a bill this morning providing for a toll road clear across the United States, because it is surprising how much we have to depend on a good road system, regardless of other modern transportation means.

I appreciate very much having been permitted the time to make a brief statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want the Senator from Pennsylvania or any other Senator, or anyone who might read my remarks, to think I am advocating doing away with ground forces. I do not believe the day will ever come when we will not need to have doughboys who can take over ground and stick our flag in the ground to indicate that the territory belongs to us. However, I believe that, instead of building our forces around naval power, as we have done in the past, we should now consider the possibility of building our forces around airpower.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. From the transportation standpoint, airpower is what saved us in Korea. I think one of the greatest military exploits in the history of America was the way we transported equipment and reinforcements of men to and in Korea. It was a magnificent accomplishment. I wish people would give more consideration to what our army accomplished in that respect in the Korean conflict.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before I turn to the subject on which I am prepared to speak, I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arizona for the address he has just made. It is the type of speech which carries upon it the brand of statesmanship.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS FROM LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, PA.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Vermont yield for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there are in the gallery today students from Lafayette College, Pa., who are studying international affairs. They are contemplating governmental service, service with business concerns, and kindred activities. They have entered upon a new element of study. I should like to have them stand up, so that Senators may be able to see these young men.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with applause.]

PLIGHT OF LOW-INCOME FARMERS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope everyone will consider seriously the message which the President has sent to the Congress relating to the plight of a million and a quarter low-income farmers.

We spend days and weeks—and even months—in seeking to maintain and raise the income of the 2 million highly mechanized farming units of our country, but it is so easy to forget the problem of those farmers who cannot afford mechanization, and could not make a decent living on their small farms even if they could afford mechanization.

Price-support programs have been very helpful to the commercial farming interests of America, but no price-support legislation is going to bring the million and a quarter small farmers selling less than \$1,500 a year from their farms to a very high level of personal security.

Even 200 percent price supports would not enable most of them to live decently.

As the President and Secretary Benson point out, these people not only must have other income, but they must be helped and shown how they can improve their present income from the comparatively small amount of agricultural production which they now have.

It will be noted that most of these extremely low-income farmers are located in 12 to 15 States.

This fact, however, does not mean that every State does not have communities which can be greatly improved through methods which we have talked a lot about, but which we have not put into fullest application.

The report to the President from the Secretary of Agriculture does not contain many new suggestions. It does recommend putting into effect our backlog of knowledge and the acquisition of more.

Very little legislation will be needed to implement a program which will enable a million farm families to make a markedly greater contribution to the national economy, to security, and to society.

There is no one solution to the problem of America's low-income farm people.

In one community, it may mean better use of their existing resources.

In another, it may require more vocational training, both agricultural and industrial; in another, it may mean a change of employment; and in still others, it may be that the communities are well adapted to small industries which will provide part-time employment for those whose production on the farm is inadequate to support a family.

We all remember the days when the county-agent system was started. Today, there are in America thousands of prosperous farmers whose status at that time was not much better than that of the million farm families which are referred to in Secretary Benson's report. It was the individual attention of the county agent which helped many low-income farmers of a generation ago to become the prosperous producers of today.

It is equally certain that if more personal attention can be paid at this time to the condition of the remaining low-income families, many of them would also attain more satisfactory levels of existence.

We have known for years that we should inaugurate and expand a program directed to the plight of low-income rural people. President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson believe that we should now have more action in this direction.

It will make a stronger America if these low-income farm people become more independent, if more of them can have higher education, if all of them can have better health.

The proposal of Secretary Benson to launch pilot operations in not less than 50 of the thousand low-income counties of the United States will give us within a few year's time most valuable criteria upon which to base more widespread operations.

Our goal, Mr. President, should be complete victory over rural poverty. As I have said, that will take little money. It will take little legislation. It will take a good deal of coordination of effort, and it will result in a better agriculture and a stronger, healthier United States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate, and for his reference to the President's report and Secretary Benson's study of this problem, for it is a serious problem which confronts agriculture, and one to which I believe a solution must be found.

I also commend the Secretary of Agriculture for commencing this vital project. It seems to me that measures must be devised to increase the income of farmers of low income. This matter is most important to 1¼ million people of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. I wish to point out that the problem we are now tackling again is not a new one. On the contrary, it has been with our country for centuries. Even before our country was established as a Nation there always were rural areas which were poverty stricken.

There is no perfect solution to the problem. There has been a constant trend toward mechanization, commercialization, and larger farming units. But we can do much. We already know how to do much to make better the life of this category of farmers who, unfortunately, for the time being, at least, have to eke out a living on very small incomes. If we can help them enjoy life more fully, we should do so. We should make a full-fledged assault upon this problem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from

Vermont yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I, too, wish to join, in association with the distinguished Senator from Kansas, in commending our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, for pointing out the very constructive suggestions which have been brought about as a result of the plan to aid the low-income farmers, who are found, as my distinguished colleague well knows, not only in the South, but in many other regions of the Nation, including the northeastern area.

This is the first time I have seen offered a really constructive suggestion as to how the low-income farm groups can better their position. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

From his work and his long labors on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I know that he certainly recognizes the value of a program of the kind proposed, and I know he will work to see that such a program is adopted, if possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine. I may say that he and I are very fortunate in living in States which do not have an entire county which qualifies as a poverty-stricken county. But that does not mean that we do not have in our own States many individual farmers who at this time are barely holding their heads above water.

I think we should realize that when, in any part of the Nation, there are a considerable number of rural persons who are living in poverty and in unfortunate conditions, such a situation affects all of us; it affects the entire country. Certainly we should do what we can to overcome these conditions wherever they may exist.

RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY RIGHTS IN A TRACT OF LAND TO THE VINELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36⁷⁵⁰/₁₀₀₀-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The unfinished business is House Joint Resolution 107, Calendar No. 228, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STUDY AND REPORT ON BURLEY TOBACCO MARKETING CONTROLS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 60, Calendar No. 229, directing a study and report on burley tobacco marketing controls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of developing basic information which will aid the Congress in formulating an improved program for the production and marketing of burley tobacco, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed (a) to make a study of the various methods of marketing control which have been or could be made applicable to burley tobacco, including farm marketing quotas, poundage limitations, acreage limitations, and a combination of both poundage and acreage limitations, and (b) to submit to the Congress on or before July 1, 1955, a detailed report thereon showing among other things the probable costs, effects, and feasibility of each type of operation studied and what legislation, if any, would be needed to put it into effect. The Secretary may conduct such hearings and receive such statements and briefs as are necessary to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution.

OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 231, Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, relating to observance of National Hospital Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join in proclaiming the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people, and to cooperate in a voluntary effort to observe National Hospital Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are dedicated to the cause of protecting the lives and providing for the health needs of all our citizens; and

Whereas our National and State hospital associations have with diligence and unceasing efforts worked to provide the highest quality care for all Americans in the Nation's hospitals; and

Whereas the American hospitals are the centers of our community's health services to its citizens; and

Whereas national recognition of the importance of hospitals in the American community has been celebrated annually since 1921 on the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 8, 1955, and ending May 14, 1955, will be observed as National Hospital Week: Now, therefore, be it.

APPOINTMENT IN A CIVILIAN POSITION OF BRIG. GEN. EDWIN B. HOWARD, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 232, Senate bill 1271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1271), Calendar No. 232, to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1271) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62), or any other provision of law, Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, may be appointed to and accept and hold a civilian position in the Department of Justice.

SEC. 2. Brigadier General Howard's appointment to, and acceptance and holding of, a civilian position in the Department of Justice shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold as a retired officer in the United States Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided, however,* That during his incumbency in a

civilian position in the Department of Justice he shall receive the compensation appertaining to such position in lieu of the retired pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Army: *Provided further*, That upon the termination of such civilian employment the payment of his retired pay shall be resumed.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the consideration of Senate bill 1271 a statement which I have had prepared explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The purpose of this legislation is to permit Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard to forego his present retired pay as a general and accept a civilian position in the Department of Justice, for which he would be paid a civilian salary. Section 2 of the bill would permit him to resume his retired status upon the termination of such civilian employment.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Attorney General. In his letter he stated that the unit of the Immigration and Naturalization Service known as the Field Inspections and Security Division is responsible for the inspection, analysis, and evaluation of all the activities of the Service for the purpose of making recommendations to the Commissioner and his staff for securing the most effective method for insuring adherence to prescribed standards and observance of Service policy at all levels of organization.

The Attorney General further stated that numerous assignments of Brigadier General Howard during his more than 30 years of active military service demonstrated exceptional organizational ability, aggressiveness tempered with mature judgment in both administrative and executive capacities. Furthermore, the Attorney General stated that by reason of certain of his military assignments, he has a personal and intimate familiarity with the conditions which pose problems for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the division which he is to head.

The Attorney General concluded with the statement that: "I am satisfied that he is eminently qualified for that position, and that his military training and experience will be of tremendous value to the Government in this important and sensitive task to which he is to be assigned."

Gen. J. M. Swing, the Commissioner of Immigration, made a personal appearance before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, in executive session, and also urged the passage of this legislation as well as the bill (S. 1272) extending the same privilege to Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge.

APPOINTMENT IN A CIVILIAN POSITION OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1272, Calendar No. 233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1272) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62), or any other provision of law, Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, may be appointed to and accept and hold a civilian position in the Department of Justice.

SEC. 2. Major General Partridge's appointment to, and acceptance and holding of, a civilian position in the Department of Justice shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold as a retired officer in the United States Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided, however*, That during his incumbency in a civilian position in the Department of Justice he shall receive the compensation appertaining to such position in lieu of the retired pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Army: *Provided further*, That upon the termination of such civilian employment the payment of his retired pay shall be resumed.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the consideration of Senate bill 1272 a statement which I have had prepared explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The purpose of this legislation is to permit the Attorney General to appoint Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, to a civilian position in the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. General law prohibits a retired Army officer, unless retired for combat connected disability, from being appointed to civilian employment with the United States at a salary or annual compensation of \$2,500 or more. The Attorney General and the Commissioner of Immigration both state that General Partridge is eminently qualified for the position to which he is to be appointed and that his main duties will be the reorganization of the border patrol and a solution of the wetback problem. If the bill is enacted, General Partridge will forego receipt of his retired pay as long as he holds the position. Section 2 of the bill would permit him to resume his retired status upon the termination of such civilian employment.

EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1, extending the Trade Agreements Act. I make this request, in order to have House bill 1 made the unfinished business, with the understanding that no votes on the bill will be taken today; and that when

Senators conclude their speeches today, the Senate will adjourn until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday, next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Texas. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Monday next be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to obligate \$63 million during each of the next 4 fiscal years, by entering into grant agreements under the Federal Airport Act for payment of the Federal share of the cost of the construction and improvement of public airports needed to develop an adequate nationwide system of public airports. Sixty million dollars of that amount would be for projects in the continental United States and \$3 million for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1855) to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and

other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, when we consider the rapid tempo at which America is developing in both military and civilian aviation, it is disturbing, indeed, to realize that our airport program throughout the 48 States has been left without adequate funds to bring airport facilities serving the hundreds of thousands of people who use the airlines and other air services up to a point where they will be modern, or capable of accommodating the new jet transport planes and other fast flying aircraft which will be in the air in a matter of only a few years.

It is later than we think, in the development of adequate airports for this new type of equipment. It is with this in mind that the bill has been introduced by my colleagues and myself.

The bill makes no change whatsoever in the basic policies and purposes previously laid down by Congress in the act. Thus there are no changes in the requirements with respect to the administration of the grants authorized, such as the distribution and apportionment of funds, the eligibility of the various types of airport construction and improvement, sponsorship requirements, congressional approval of projects for large airports—class 4 and larger—and so forth. The only purpose of the bill is to prescribe specific amounts that may be obligated by grant agreement over the period indicated, namely, the next 4 years, rather than to leave such amounts to be determined from year to year, as is now the case.

At the time of its enactment in 1946 the Federal Airport Act contemplated or intended that \$520 million in Federal grants would be made available over a period of approximately 7 years to match State and local funds in the development of a nationwide system of public airports. The only limitation on the availability of the \$520 million within the 7-year period is the provision that not in excess of \$100 million may be appropriated for projects in the continental United States in any one fiscal year. Consequently the States and their counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions began planning for airport development on the assumption that Federal funds within the amounts stated in the Federal Airport Act would be available for matching purposes—generally on a 50-50 basis—over the 7-year period prescribed in the statute. In the great majority of cases it took the States and local agencies involved 1 or 2 years to complete arrangements for financing their share of the cost of the airport development needed and to develop the plans for the actual construction. The latter, of course, required the development of an overall master plan of the ultimate airport facility that was considered needed to serve civil aviation within the foreseeable future. Also a majority of the public agencies involved are not able to obtain within 1 or even 2 fiscal years the full amount of their share of the cost of the entire amount of airport construction costs that would

be incurred in developing the entire airport facility contemplated. This, of course, results in the necessity of planning for the total airport development to be undertaken in stages over a period of years.

For the first full fiscal year after the enactment of the act, \$45 million was appropriated for the program. It is my understanding that a larger amount was not appropriated for that fiscal year for the reasons previously stated, namely, that many of the States and local agencies had not had time to complete their planning and financing arrangements, and in many instances, the enactment of legislation necessary to enable them to participate in the program that early. It was contemplated at that time that larger appropriations would be made during the succeeding years, as the States and local agencies completed their planning and financing arrangements. However, only \$32,500,000 was appropriated for the fiscal year 1948. Further, subsequent annual appropriations have not even approximated half of the authorized amount of \$100 million. In fact, as of today, approximately 9 years after enactment of the act, there has only been appropriated and made available for projects \$236,221,154, out of the total \$520 million originally authorized for a 7-year period.

Many States, municipalities, and other local agencies have suffered considerable losses due to the preparation of plans and making of financing arrangements, such as issuance of bonds, and so forth, in contemplation of the availability of the Federal assistance in accordance with the authorization prescribed under the act and the subsequent failure of the Federal Government to provide that assistance.

In 1950 it became apparent that the airport development program which the act contemplated being completed in approximately 7 years, would not be completed within that time. The Congress, therefore, by the enactment of Public Law 846, 81st Congress, approved September 27, 1950, amended the act to extend the program over an additional 5 years, namely, until June 30, 1958, instead of June 30, 1953.

Notwithstanding the planning and financing arrangements that had been made by States and municipalities in contemplation of continuation of the program, the Secretary of Commerce in early 1953 decided that no further funds would be requested for the program unless and until a complete and thorough study had been made and disclosed a definite need for Federal assistance in public airport development. To this end the Secretary appointed a committee composed of Government, State, municipal, and private industry representatives to make a thorough and complete study of the matter and to report to him their findings and recommendations by the end of 1953. This action, of course, completely upset the planning of States and local agencies. Many of them had undertaken the development of their airport facilities in stages, in order to utilize the small amounts of money that had been becoming available during the prior years and with the expectancy that at

least these smaller amounts of money would continue to be available until the entire \$500 million had been utilized. Many were faced with the possibility of not being able to complete facilities that were only partially completed, having been undertaken on a stage basis in contemplation of additional funds becoming available in the following years for the remaining stages.

In the fall of 1953, the committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce completed its investigation and study and reached the conclusion that the Federal Government should participate in the cost of public airports needed to serve air commerce, and recommended that the program under the Federal Airport Act be continued. The report of the committee called particular attention to the fact that larger amounts of funds than had been previously appropriated over the years would have to be made available to effectively and efficiently carry out the purposes of the act.

On the basis of the findings and recommendations of the committee \$22,500,000 was requested and appropriated for the fiscal year 1955. At this time, as in the case of the first appropriation for 1948, there were statements and indications to the effect that a larger amount was not being requested for the fiscal year 1955 for the reason that that amount would be sufficient to get the program started again after the 1 year layoff—that the States and local public agencies had deferred their planning during the 1 year layoff pending the decision of the Federal Government as to whether the program would be continued. The general understanding of the States, municipalities, and other local agencies was that the \$22,500,000 was just to get the program underway again and that the larger amounts required to meet their needs and to carry out the program, as contemplated by the act, would be made available during the years following.

Accordingly, as in the case of the years immediately following the enactment of the act, the States and local agencies again started their planning and negotiating for financing, and so forth, in contemplation of Federal grants being made available in amounts approximating the amount authorized by the act, or at least considerably in excess of the relatively small amounts heretofore appropriated. According to the budget for the fiscal year 1956, however, only some \$11,500,000 is being requested, which is smaller than the annual appropriation of any prior year, with the exception of the fiscal year 1954, for which no appropriation was made. The States and local agencies are therefore again faced with the loss of considerable planning and financing costs that have been incurred in contemplation of the reestablishment of the Federal airport program on a scale approximating that which is contemplated by the act.

In addition to the loss in money that has been suffered as a result of the failure of the Federal Government to provide the funds contemplated by the act, within the period of time prescribed in the act, civil aviation has suffered because of the delay in providing much needed airport facilities.

In order to develop the nationwide system of public airports that is needed to serve civil aviation, such as is contemplated by the Federal Airport Act, it is essential that the States and local agencies be given definite assurance of the money that will be available for matching their local money when and as their plans and financing arrangements are completed and they are ready to undertake the actual construction work involved. Only a relatively few airports in the country today can accommodate the civil jet transport plane that undoubtedly will be in service by the time the airport construction financed with funds authorized by the proposed bill is completed. In fact, it is entirely possible that jet aircraft will be in service even before that time. In any event, the planning for its accommodation must be undertaken now or in the fairly immediate future. Furthermore, even without regard to the advent of civil jet aircraft transportation, municipalities are finding that it is necessary to plan and provide for almost continuous expansion and improvement of their airport facilities if the needs of the constantly increasing civil air traffic are to be met.

The same situation prevails with respect to road and highway construction and for that reason the highway programs have consistently been authorized on a 2-year basis, with the exception of the postwar highway program authorized by the Highway Act of 1944 which authorized funds for projects over a period of 3 years. In addition, in recognition of the necessity for allowance of time for planning, and so forth, prior to actual construction, the highway acts consistently authorize funds to be obligated during the 2 fiscal years following the fiscal year next succeeding the year in which the authorization is granted. In other words, the Highway Act of 1952 authorized the obligation of specific amounts for road and highway projects during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, and the Highway Act of 1954 authorized the obligation of specific amount for such purposes during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Therefore, the States were assured in 1952 of the Federal highway money that would be available for matching their money in the second and third year hence, namely, in 1954 and 1955. Likewise, in 1954, they were assured of the Federal money that would be available in 1956 and 1957.

In the airport program there is even more need for advance knowledge and assurance of the availability of Federal assistance because of the fact that municipalities as well as States are involved and funds for the local share of costs in many instances must be obtained from the issuance of bonds pursuant to elections held for that purpose. In addition, highway network planning is much farther advanced than is airport planning, the Federal-aid highway program having been in effect since at least the early 1920's.

The bill I have introduced would provide the States and their political subdivisions with definite assurance that \$60 million will be available to them for grants under the Federal Airport Act

for each of the next succeeding 4 fiscal years, and the Territories and possessions that \$3 million will be available to them for that purpose for each of such years. This will enable the States, Territories, and so forth, to undertake the planning, financing, and other preliminary work for development and improvement of public airports needed for air commerce, with definite assurance of the amount of funds for the payment of the Federal share of the cost thereof that will be available to them as and when they are able to undertake the actual construction work within that 4-year period.

Attention is invited to the fact that this authorization of \$63 million for each of the next 4 years, or a total of \$252 million, added to prior appropriations in the amount of \$236,221,154, is approximately \$31,700,000 less than the \$520 million originally authorized.

CLARIFYING AMENDMENT

Section 1 of the bill would amend section 2 (a) of the act, relating to the definition of "airport development." This amendment is intended primarily for clarification purposes in that it specifically provides that airport passenger or freight terminal buildings are among the types of airport administrative buildings that are eligible under the act. It is believed that the amendment is in accordance with the original intent of the Congress at the time of enactment of the Federal Airport Act in 1946.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 3 (a) of the act in two respects, namely, first, by prescribing a specific time limit for each annual revision of the national airport plan, and second, by providing that the projects in such plan shall include all types of airport development that are eligible for Federal aid under the act.

Under the existing provisions of the act there is no specific time prescribed for each annual revision of the national airport plan, the act merely providing that the plan be revised annually. As a result, in the past, each annual revision has been issued at a different time, the revision for one year, 1954, not having been issued until the fall of that year. Under the act no project application may include any airport development other than that included in the national airport plan. Therefore, it would appear almost essential that each annual revision of the plan be completed within a reasonable time before the commencement of the next fiscal year, so that plans may be developed for the submission of applications for projects included in that revision that are to be undertaken with funds appropriated for such fiscal year. It is believed that 3 months, as prescribed in the amendment, is a sufficiently reasonable period of time for that purpose.

The second part of the amendment to section 3 (a) is intended to make it clear that the annual revisions of the national airport plan are not to exclude any types of airport development eligible for Federal participation under the act. It is entirely possible that during any particular fiscal year the amount of funds authorized may not be sufficient to enable the Secretary to participate in

all of the projects which are needed at that time to carry out the purposes of the act, and under the act he clearly has discretion, and in fact has a duty, to so allocate the funds available as to accomplish those projects which are of the greatest importance and urgency from the national standpoint. However, this he is expected to do on a State-by-State and project-for-project basis, by use of his programming and project approval authority, and not by making all projects of certain types ineligible for inclusion in the program, as would be the result if all such projects were excluded from the national airport plan. The amendment is intended to make it clear that the national airport plan is not to be so used.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT GROWERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to be associated with my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] in sponsoring S. 1770, the domestic parity certificate bill, of which he has recently spoken.

When I was assigned in 1940 to write a series of articles about Oregon's Senator Charles Linza McNary, I first became acquainted with the so-called two-price plan for the marketing of farm products, particularly with respect to wheat. Senator McNary, who was a friend of mine, had sponsored such a proposal in the 1920's, but it was vetoed by President Coolidge after its passage through Congress in the form of the McNary-Haugen bill. Yet this illustrious Oregon Senator continued to have faith in the idea.

In 1954 a similar proposal, known by this time as the domestic parity certificate plan, was discussed in the Oregon senatorial campaign. My opponent abruptly endorsed the plan, although he had shown practically no interest in it during nearly 11 years in Congress.

Friends and supporters in eastern Oregon, one of the great wheat-producing areas of the Nation, urged me to approve the plan, too. After talking over the matter with my wife one night at the height of the campaign, I decided not to do so. In the first place, in the midst of the campaign, I had had no genuine opportunity to study and analyze the domestic parity plan carefully. If I endorsed it under such circumstances, it would be purely a political decision rather than one based on the economic factors at stake. I made up my mind that this kind of endorsement would not be fair to me, and would not be fair to the eastern Oregon wheatgrowers, and to the people of the State of Oregon, generally.

WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE BACKS PLAN

But, since the November 2 election, I have had a chance to look at the domestic parity plan a good deal more objectively and in less hurried and frenzied conditions. Early in December, at the Multnomah Hotel in Portland, I had a conference lasting nearly 4 hours with past and present officials of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. Here in Washington, D. C., during the recent months, I have spent considerable time with two

spokesmen for that organization, Marion T. Weatherford, of Arlington, Oreg., and Jack Smith, of Condon, Oreg. In fact, I had the privilege of inviting other Members of the Senate to hear these men explain the domestic parity plan in terms of the problems now confronting the wheatgrowers of the entire Nation. The explanation of the plan by Mr. Weatherford and Mr. Smith also impressed other Senators with many of the merits of this particular proposal.

As a result of these conferences, and because of close personal study of the plan, I now have decided to join with my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] in sponsoring this bill providing the domestic parity certificate plan for wheat.

My decision has been shaped, in part at least, by my increasing alarm over the general plight of agriculture throughout the United States—a plight which contrasts jarringly with the present boom on Wall Street in the stock market.

In recent months the deepening agricultural crisis has increasingly occupied the attention of many Members of the Congress.

INCOME OF AMERICAN FARMERS ON WAY DOWN

Congressional committees have repeatedly studied the farm problem and have reported the ominous downward trend. In reporting the Agricultural Act of 1954 in the 83d Congress, the House Committee on Agriculture showed in its report on the bill a 13-percent decline in net farm income in the preceding 2 years, while the rest of the economy reached new heights. In reporting a new farm bill last month, the same committee again reviewed the facts:

Farm prices down an average of 22 percent since 1952. Net farm income down 28 percent since 1947—10 percent below 1953, with further declines scheduled for this year and 1956.

The House Appropriations Committee reports that "the cost of farming continues to increase, with a 14-percent increase in prices paid by farmers during the past 5 years." Farm mortgage debt has nearly doubled since the end of World War II.

Farmers' share in the national income has dropped from 9.4 percent in 1951 to 7.2 percent in 1954.

The New York Times and other leading newspapers and periodicals have also drawn public attention to the squeeze on farmers' income resulting from continued high operating costs in a time of falling farm prices and stringent acreage limitations.

A well-documented article in the U. S. News & World Report for March 25 reminds us of the sinister parallel with the 1920's, when a spectacular industrial and financial boom obscured the early danger signals of a prolonged agricultural slump. The article states the facts with simple logic:

Farmers are getting less for their crops. They are being forced to grow less. Their costs are high. Their incomes are shrinking.

And it concludes that "the farm problem is worsening, now that more trouble lies ahead."

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS NOT THE RIGHT ANSWER

Yet President Eisenhower is offering no leadership beyond continued insistence on the so-called flexible support program—an economic wringer which seems designed to seek a kind of agricultural "survival of the fittest" by driving a substantial number of farm families to the brink of bankruptcy. But when we remember that more than 20 million Americans live on farms, and more than 30 million in rural areas economically dependent on farm prosperity, we see the illusion of expecting a continued boom for banks, for big business, for the stock market, while an agricultural depression threatens this one-third of the Nation.

The crisis is particularly acute in the case of wheat. In its April issue, the Farm Journal poses the question, "Can we rescue wheat?" This article, and the other sources I have mentioned, give us some idea of the dimensions of the problem.

The carryover of wheat on July 1 will be nearly a billion bushels—as much as five times the amount considered a normal carryover—and \$2½ billion worth of that is held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The carryover will be more than a whole year's supply of wheat for this country, without this year's crop.

Yet acreage restrictions, which have forced 24 million acres, about 30 percent, out of wheat, and reduced support percentages, give little promise for restoring order to wheat production. Rather, they add to the pressure to grow varieties which will yield the most bushels per acre, regardless of quality—to produce more wheat, of types which no one else may want, for the No. 1 customer, the Federal Government.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN OFFERS THREE MAJOR ADVANTAGES

Far from reducing these pressures, the further lowering of support levels under President Eisenhower's so-called flexible support program would only force the wheat farmer to squeeze every last bushel from each acre of allotment remaining to him, regardless of quality or demand on the commercial market.

The 90 percent of parity support program certainly was not a perfect answer to the wheat farmers' problems. But its greatest drawback—the accumulation of Government-owned surpluses—is continued under the President's program for flexible supports, flexible only downward, without accomplishing the supposed objective of protecting the farmer.

I believe that the certificate plan may well be the most constructive alternative, which deserves a trial. Briefly stated, it offers the following advantages:

First, it would return the sale and purchase of wheat to the open market, where the price is determined by factors of quality and demand.

Second, the resulting lower market price would make it possible for more wheat to move into export, feed, and industrial uses, and thus increase the total overall use of wheat.

Third, it would guarantee wheat farmers full parity on that part of the annual crop which goes into domestic human consumption.

Finally, and most important, it should get the Government out of the business of buying, storing, and trying to dispose of wheat.

The bill which my colleagues and I have sponsored is basically similar to subtitle D of H. R. 9680 of the 83d Congress, by which the House of Representatives last year adopted the domestic parity certificate plan for wheat. And the House Agriculture Committee has again this year included the plan in its recommendation for farm legislation to be enacted by the 84th Congress.

This bill may not be a perfect bill. A certificate program for wheat must be fitted carefully into the structure of our agricultural economy, particularly in relation to our support programs for corn and other feed grains. Thus, it is contemplated that the Government would continue to make available support loans for wheat at a lower level, related to that for corn. Yet these support loans must not become another "market" for wheat, if the plan is to succeed in ending the accumulation of surplus wheat by the Government.

Moreover, operations under the certificate program need to be coordinated with the policies of our Government to cooperate with other friendly wheat exporting and wheat importing nations in seeking stability in the world market.

For the foreseeable future, at least, it will be necessary to continue restrictions on wheat acreage in order to keep production within manageable limits. As the price of wheat is to be determined by supply and demand for different varieties in the open market, the administration of production controls to maintain market prices close to the support and world price levels will also have to be thoroughly thought out before the plan is put into operation.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN MERITS FULL AND FAIR TRIAL

I hope that these problems, as well as the obvious advantages of the domestic parity certificate plan will receive the careful scrutiny of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The alarming downward trend in farm prosperity, to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks, shows that some action will have to be taken during the present session of Congress to review and revitalize our agricultural programs.

In choosing between alternative courses, we will not find a perfect solution. I hope that we will give the domestic parity certificate plan a thorough trial. There is no substitute for experience, and I am sure that the farm problems which may arise will be easier to solve than are those created by the present policies of the national administration.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Hottest Farm Argument of the Year," from the Farm Journal, written by Herschel D. Newman, master,

National Grange, explaining why the National Grange supports the certificate plan for wheat.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOTTEST FARM ARGUMENT OF THE YEAR

(By Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Grange favors a two-price plan for wheat: "It will increase sales; bolster farm income; cut tax costs; and do away with acreage controls and regulations," says Newsom.)

The present wheat program is a failure. The jam it has led us into was explained in Farm Journal last month.

This is our most serious commodity problem of the generation. To continue down the present road is to insure lower income and less markets for United States wheat growers.

Flexing wheat-price supports down to 75 percent of parity is not the answer:

That will only lower wheat farmers' incomes.

It will do little—or nothing—to either increase the sale of wheat or decrease production.

What is the answer then? The only sensible, workable plan that we've seen is one that organized wheat growers are supporting. Developed by the Grange several years ago, it's called the domestic parity or wheat certificate plan. Actually, it's a plan to limit effective price supports to the wheat used in the United States for food.

Remember three facts:

1. Your entire wheat crop (except wheat you fed or stored) would sell on the open market—at whatever price your quality, variety, or type of wheat would bring. The better grade wheat would naturally bring more.

2. Selling on the open market at prevailing prices would also eliminate the need for extensive program policing or segregation of wheat.

3. You'd get certificates—and price supports—on your proportionate share of the wheat crop used for food (to be estimated each year by the Secretary of Agriculture). You'd get this support by cashing the certificates.

Each wheat farmer would then adjust his own acreage—by deciding how much unsupported wheat he wanted to raise above his share of the supported, domestic food market.

As time went on, you'd get more, or fewer, certificates, depending on whether you raised or lowered your production. Farmers who raise the better quality wheat, or raise it more cheaply, would be more likely to increase output. Thus we would be using the historic function of price to change production patterns according to efficiency and ability.

The Secretary of Agriculture would set a floor price through a stop-loss wheat loan designed to prevent dumping on the world market or on our own feed market. He'd set this floor by taking into account the feed equivalent value of wheat in the United States and the probable world market level.

Such a floor would be temporarily necessary because of the sheer size of the present surplus. In fact, it would be necessary no matter what kind of a wheat program we have. Acreage controls would also be continued for a while for the same reason, but they could soon be abandoned.

There are several advantages to this plan:

Wheat income would be as high or higher than under any other program.

Production controls would be greatly minimized—eventually eliminated so that farm-

ers would use their own judgment to adjust production.

Livestock and poultry farmers could grow their own feed wheat, even sell to each other.

People might pay a higher price temporarily for their cereal products, but this would be offset by progressively eliminating the Government expense of the present program.

It would lead to greater farm efficiency and better conservation.

Because of the competitive prices more wheat would be sold for feed in foreign trade and for new uses.

It would get the Government rapidly out of the business of handling, buying, selling, and storing wheat. Private trading would take over. This is the way to expand markets.

Yes; bigger markets are there. We can gradually recapture and expand global markets. We used to export a third of our crop; now we export only when the rest of the world doesn't have wheat to sell at our Government's support price minus subsidy.

Wheat has been priced out of the feed market. By allowing wheat to sell at going prices, it will take its normal place in all secondary markets instead of going into Government storage.

Some corn growers argue against this program. Actually, they have little to worry about. The stop-loss price floor would take care of this. Besides, wheat never was, and never will be, a serious feed-grain competitor of King Corn.

Corn outyields wheat by far. It can be raised for less.

And when wheatgrowers are asked to take the competitive price for nonfood wheat, a lot of them are going to grow something else.

To sum up, wheatgrowers, in order to share world and feed markets, may do 1 of 3 things:

1. They may flex the price of all United States wheat down to the world level—about \$1.50 to \$1.60 per bushel (which amounts to practically no wheat price support program at all).

2. They may continue to subsidize—at 60 cents on up—all export wheat. This is bound to lead to still further losses in world markets because of governmental stagnation of sales.

3. They may develop some kind of domestic parity, or self-financing two-price plan, to protect the income of wheatgrowers—while making it possible for them to compete for secondary markets.

This is not a cure-all. It will, however, put wheat into use instead of into storage. And it's a part of the commodity-by-commodity approach so necessary for improving the farm program—and it needs to be done now.

VACANCY IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to refer very briefly to one other matter which concerns my home State, and which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, this week marks the end of 1 whole year since the elevation of Judge James A. Fee to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit—1 year during which the President has failed to fill the vacancy thus created in the United States District Court for Oregon.

In 12 months, Mr. President, the Eisenhower "team" has been unable to agree upon the selection of a much-needed Federal judge for the district of Oregon. Of course, I have no firsthand knowledge of the reason for this delay; but, I regret to say, it seems to be a case of

politics and patronage first, and judicial needs second.

Judge Fee was appointed to the court of appeals on April 1, 1954, after many years of able service on the United States District Court in Oregon, and he actually left the district court on April 30—a year ago next Saturday. For 12 months since that day, the Eisenhower administration has virtually turned its back upon the vacant judgeship in Oregon, while the Republican Party engages in internal guerrilla warfare over the vacancy.

Perhaps the President does not think it necessary to have three Federal judges in our State. Should we perhaps expect him to send to the Senate, instead of an appointment, legislation to abolish the post?

Mr. President, in recent years the Federal court in Portland, Ore., has maintained a good record of keeping up with its docket, of dispensing justice to litigants with the dispatch which in practice is itself such an important ingredient of justice. It has managed to maintain this record in spite of the occasional illness or infirmity of one or another of its judges.

But in the last year, Mr. President, with only two judges left on the Federal bench in Oregon, it has been necessary to have cases tried by a succession of visiting judges from other districts. In the year during which the President has failed to fill the vacancy, the Oregon court has enjoyed the temporary services of Judge G. H. Boldt, from Tacoma, Judges Bowen and Lindberg, from Seattle, Judge Ling, of Arizona, Judge Clark, of Idaho, and Judge Pope, of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Of course, I want to make it very clear that there has been no criticism of the judicial service of these excellent Federal judges, but it is also obvious that the temporary assignment to Oregon of judges from other districts creates problems in their own districts, as well as in Oregon. Of necessity, it becomes more difficult to set cases for trial on a definite date until the visiting judge arrives, and in some instances it becomes necessary to have cases tried before a different judge than the one who presided at pretrial conferences. I need not speak of the confusion this creates in connection with the orderly administration of justice.

It is clear to leading members of the bar of my home State of Oregon that this system is not a satisfactory substitute for the long delayed appointment of a new judge to the vacancy on the Federal court.

I have not expected, of course, to be consulted about this appointment by the Republican administration. So far, the only contact I have had has been an interview back in February with the FBI about one candidate, Judge Wm. G. East, of Lane County. I gave Mr. East a clean bill of health. Then an Oregon newspaper published an editorial implying that East had been involved in an alleged drunken-driving incident. I felt obliged to ask the FBI to make a review of the incident. I have heard nothing further about the episode. That, to my

knowledge, is where the judgeship now stands.

My colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I have stated many times that we will not oppose any of the possible appointments which have been mentioned and which have the support of the Oregon State Bar, unless we are presented with reasons not now known to us. I believe, Mr. President, that this necessary and long overdue judicial appointment for my State should no longer be held up because of political skirmishing in the Republican Party over who should get this choice plum.

A few months ago there was much discussion in the press to the effect that action on the nomination of Judge Harlan to the Supreme Court of the United States had been delayed 3 or 4 months because the Committee on the Judiciary allegedly had not considered the matter as speedily as the White House had wished. Perhaps the criticism was justified. I was not sufficiently close to the situation to know.

But I think it is significant that for 1 whole year—12 months—a vacancy has existed in the United States district court in Oregon, a court of original jurisdiction, so far as the Federal bench is concerned. Yet the administration has not made one move, or certainly nothing visible to the naked eye or to the general public, to fill that vacancy.

I submit that if Oregon is entitled to 3 Federal district judges—and Congress, in the form of a statute, has authorized 3 Federal district judges for Oregon—it is the duty of the administration to make an appointment.

In February, when the vacancy had existed for about 10 months, I recommended to the Department of Justice an outstanding lawyer in Medford, Oreg., Mr. Edward C. Kelly. Mr. Kelly is a veteran of World War II, a distinguished member of the bar, a leader in his community, a former member of the Oregon State Legislature, and is himself the son of an illustrious former judge in our State. It seems to me it is up to the administration either to accept my recommendation of Mr. Edward C. Kelly or to make an appointment of its own; but I do not believe that the vacancy on the Federal district bench in Oregon should be continued beyond 1 year.

LOW INCOME IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I feel compelled to speak briefly on a message sent to Congress yesterday by the President on the problem of low income in agriculture. All of us interested in agriculture welcome the recognition by the executive branch of this major social and economic problem. However, I think it would be putting it mildly to say that the program is most disappointing. If this is all that the Department of Agriculture can suggest after a full year's study, then the low-income farmers will have to look elsewhere for some practical assistance.

Nothing new is provided in either the study or the recommendations which were presented to Congress as of yesterday. Legislative proposals for a broader

attack on the acute problem are already before Congress under Democratic sponsorship, and they come much closer to carrying out the objectives outlined by the President than do his own meager recommendations.

After a year of study, the Department of Agriculture as of today has not even caught up with the broad recommendations for a long-range attack on the problem of low-income farmers which were submitted to Congress by the Department of Agriculture back in 1949.

I have in my hand the report of several hearings entitled "Low-Income Families," held by the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 81st Congress.

Also, I have before me a "Synopsis," and "Conclusions, Recommendations, and Report," of the same subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, entitled "Families and Economic Stability," of the 2d session of the 81st Congress.

As I pointed out a moment ago, long-range studies were made in the field in 1949 pertaining to some of the difficulties which face a large part of the farm population. The intervention of the Korean war suspended action in that direction at that time. Those reports were made late in 1949. By June 1950, the Korean war had started.

However, most of the same objectives are before Congress in a proposed family-farm development bill, S. 1199, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has long given attention to this particular problem in agriculture; and in my own family-farm policy review, Senate Joint Resolution 20. These two measures supplement each other; one providing for a practical approach to a more effective action program to help the low-income farmers; the other providing for an annual checkup to make certain that all the farm programs are doing what they are intended to do toward aiding the farmers. I recommend that my colleagues who may be interested in the President's message take a look at these two measures now before the Senate.

It is my hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will proceed with hearings on the measures and will submit a program which will meet the situation better than the administration's disappointing program ever can.

We welcome the President's support for the objectives of these Democratic-sponsored measures. At least, we are now publicly agreed on the common objective of greater attention to the human resources in the struggle for survival of American farmers having less than \$1,000 a year cash income, instead of considering such farmers expendable, as previous farm policies of the administration have indicated was the idea.

I cannot help noting some of the effects of the administration's twists and turns on the farm policy, which are similar to its twists and turns on foreign policy. I could not help thinking there may have been an early mistake in the appointments to the Cabinet. I am certain the President wanted to have as Secretary of Agriculture one who had a

firm agricultural policy. Likewise, I feel certain he wanted to have as Secretary of State one who had a flexible foreign policy. Somehow or other the appointment signals must have become mixed.

It would be interesting to lay alongside the President's fine objectives some of the quotations from statements by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Butz, saying very bluntly that agriculture is now big business; and if a farmer cannot survive, he had better get out. That was the established line and the established policy of the administration until the report on low-income farm families was brought to our attention by the President only as of yesterday.

It is also interesting to note that while the President's message talks about increased loan authorizations, increased technical assistance for the Soil Conservation Service, and increased funds for vocational education, the same President and his departments have consistently sent to Congress budgets reducing the funds required for farm-loan authorizations through the Farmers' Home Administration. The President, through the Department of Agriculture, has raised interest rates, thus making it more difficult for farmers to take advantage of credit assistance. The Bureau of the Budget, which is an arm of the Executive Office of the President, has sought to reduce rather than to increase the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service. And it is set to slash rather than increase funds for vocational education.

Mr. President, we get high-sounding pronouncements in these messages, but we get very little substance to back them up; and I am of the opinion that it is going to take more than a well-worded, cleverly and wisely conceived message to bring some semblance of equality of treatment to our farm families. It is going to take much more than words; it is going to take action.

I suggest to my colleagues that they read the fine print in the recommendations submitted by the President. While emphasizing the need for greater vocational training in the low-income group areas, it does not propose to provide such training. What it really says is that the administration wants the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage the States to expand vocational training in rural areas. That is a nice way of having somebody pay the bill while you call the tune.

Please note that the President in his message simply tried to shift the burden back to the States.

I regret that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, in many of her proposals before the Congress of the United States, or our committees, has advocated some kind of do it yourself formula. We have a do it yourself formula that some of us individually carry out in our own homes in the form of repair jobs, and even then there are indications that the do it yourself advocates sometimes require professional treatment later on in order to repair the damage they have done.

I point out one more inconsistency. Recommendation 15 of the President's

program calls for the Secretary of Agriculture each year to submit a comprehensive report to the President on progress of activities directed toward alleviating the problems of low-income farmers.

Mr. President, I have before me a report from the Bureau of the Budget reporting on my resolution (S. J. Res. 20), which would require such an annual review and incorporation of resulting recommendations in the economic report.

I make note of the fact that the President of the United States, in his message, asked that the Secretary of Agriculture make a yearly report on progress of activities directed toward alleviating the problems of low-income farmers.

That was exactly what was provided in the resolution which I introduced in the Senate of the United States on January 14, as Senate Joint Resolution 20; and the Bureau of the Budget, in the report on that resolution, had this to say:

It is questionable whether the family-farm problem changes rapidly enough to warrant an annual review.

Here is the President's own executive office which says categorically to the Committee on Agriculture, despite the messages sent yesterday:

It is questionable whether the family-farm problem changes rapidly enough to warrant an annual review.

The very thing the President recommended yesterday, his own executive agency said, on April 21, should not be done.

I merely wish to say I do not know how many administrations there are operating. Possibly the President's office is not informed what the Bureau of the Budget is doing, or possibly the Bureau of the Budget is not informed what the President's office is doing; but I suggest the law of the land requires that each know what the other is doing.

The Bureau of the Budget further said:

If the pertinent facts were to be assembled and analyzed annually, the conduct of such a periodic review would likely be quite expensive.

The President, however, tells us the Secretary of Agriculture should make such a review and report to him annually. He apparently did not think it was too expensive yesterday, but on the 21st of April, his personal representative, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said it should not be done, and that if it was done it would be expensive.

This is the type of language which appeals to both groups in America—those who would like to have it done and those who would not. This is a good way to stay popular, as long as someone does not expose what is going on. But I submit there is no consistency of policy or program. It is downright double talk, and there is no intention to implement it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota was impressed, as I was, to hear some of the comments

about this being a brandnew idea. I heard it said today by one of our distinguished friends across the aisle that this is the first time anyone had come forward with any such idea as this. Did the Senator hear that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I heard it. I want to say to the Senator I was just alluding to the fact that even back in 1949 the distinguished Senator from Alabama was on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was chairman of the subcommittee which made the study.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It made the report which I hold in my hand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has the Senator seen the recommendations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely have. I note that the Senator introduced a measure on the subject on February 23, 1955.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if he has read the statement I put in the RECORD at that time and the bill I introduced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have a copy of the statement before me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator had preceded that by a month or more with the introduction of a measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I introduced my proposal on January 14.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Which covered some of the same ground, but covered other ground as well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So, as stated by some of our friends, the idea of proposing technical studies of low-income families was not heard for the first time in the President's message. Had the Senator heard of the idea before?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I heard it yesterday in the message as if it was a news flash. It was just as much of a news flash as would be the announcement of the Magna Carta.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator recall that in my resolution—I am not sure the measure introduced by the Senator from Minnesota contained this particular provision—it was provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should pick out 500 low-income counties and do the technical work in those areas? Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. That is in section 3 of the Senator's proposal. I have it in my hand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To hear some persons talk about the proposal, one would think it was a brandnew idea. I dare say the headlines will probably scream out about "Ike's farm idea."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The headlines will probably scream "New Idea. New Idea." It is just as new as old candles.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It reminds me of something I read in the press the other day. The press wrote about "Ike's highway program." The headline read, "Ike Will Get His Highway Program," and one would presume that the article related that the Eisenhower road program was going through Congress. If one read the article, he would find it said that, of course, the committee is not going to agree to the financing plan, and, of course, it is not going to agree to the scheme which was advanced, but the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has

introduced a bill, and undoubtedly that bill will be reported and a highway program will be enacted. So they tabbed that as the highway road program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is not the same thing true of the proposed low-income farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The President said he was for roads, so if any program is enacted, it will be said it is the President's program. The President said he is for the low-income farm program, so if any low-income farm program is enacted, it will be stated that it was the President's program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. By the way, I wonder if the Senator remembers, when the question came up year before last, the proposal that surplus farm commodities be made available to friendly nations throughout the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota will recall that he offered an amendment to that effect in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I recall that very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With solid Democratic support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I am sure the Senator will remember the solid Republican opposition to that amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember it, sir, very vividly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Minnesota remembers his offering of the amendment, here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I remember it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And I am sure the Senator from Minnesota remembers what the Republican majority did to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I remember that, too.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, within a few days, the tremendous program came to us from the White House, recommending exactly and identically what the Senator from Minnesota had proposed in his amendment. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I do. Let me say that perhaps other Senators will recall the incident. I had earlier requested some information on the program I had advanced from the executive agencies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Senator from Minnesota had obtained approval of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; there had been approval of it by the Foreign Operations Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the President had not heard of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, they had not told the President about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, as in the case of the release of the Yalta papers, the President had not heard of it because those in the departments had not told him about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. That situation was similar to the one in the case of the President's recent message, following the Senator's introduction of his bill on the same subject. We were told that it could not be done and, furthermore, that even if it could be done, it would be too expensive.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Although I do not believe the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget have yet responded to my bill—and I shall await with great interest their report on it—now it seems they have recommended the same thing in the program the President sent to us on yesterday; that is to say, they recommended a part of it; they did not go all the way.

While I am on my feet, let me ask another question of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota: Is it not true that many of the things the President recommended in his message of yesterday, he can do today under existing laws? Certainly he can tell the Secretary of Agriculture what to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed he can.

While we in the Senate are discussing these matters, the President can tell the Secretary of Agriculture—who is trotting around in the drought-stricken areas—to come back home and take action to reduce the interest rates on emergency loans. I can imagine how popular the Secretary of Agriculture is with a farmer who has lost his crop and has lost his livestock and has suffered from a drop in farm commodity prices; and now the Secretary of Agriculture comes to him and says to him, "I am here to give you a little help; and I am happy to say that we have raised the interest rate by 2 percent."

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is said that is done in order to make such loans competitive with private loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yet the President follows that with a suggested program of how to help the farmers. Probably there should be some liaison between the White House and the Department of Agriculture. Does not the Senator from Minnesota think that would be a good thing to have?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would be very, very helpful. Of course, I do not wish to upset what seems to be the present program, under which those in responsibility in the administration do not talk to one another. But if they believe that things are not in good shape, they might call on one another and discuss these programs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certain that the Senator from Minnesota is of the same opinion that I am. I, too, do not wish to see the program upset. But, after all, the Department of Agriculture administers the program. What good can be done by all the laws Congress passes, if the Department which administers the laws does the kind of administrative job Secretary Benson has done, so that the President can talk one way and the Secretary of Agriculture, who is administering the program, can act in another way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama has undoubtedly noted in the President's message that one of the rec-

ommendations is to increase technical assistance for soil conservation. Is not that interesting? In his message, the President tells the American people, "Increase the technical assistance for soil conservation." Then the Bureau of the Budget comes running down here, like Scrooge, and says, "Cut it."

Then the President says, "We should provide more vocational training to farmers." What a warm heart the President has. What great compassion he has for people. But then, all at once comes down the Bureau of the Budget, the President's own executive agency, and says, "Cut it."

That has happened again and again. Even in the case of the home-economics pamphlets issued by the Department of Agriculture, the same thing has happened. Recently the Department of Agriculture decided that it would stop distributing such prepared material, which it had assembled, and which is of assistance to thousands and thousands of farm homes. In that connection, the Department has assembled some very important research data. The President says, in his message, that we must do more and more to bring better education and modern living into the homes of those who have small incomes. But just last week the Department of Agriculture said, "Stop it."

I do not wish to criticize the President's objectives. I think everyone in the Nation believes the President has fine instincts and good intentions and honorable objectives. I merely wish he would hire a Cabinet which would agree with him. If he does not hire or appoint such a Cabinet, I wish he would exercise the responsibilities and prerogatives of his office, by calling the members of his Cabinet to come into his office, one at a time, and then asking each one, "Did you read my message?" I believe that might be somewhat helpful.

But, Mr. President, I am afraid that the situation we are observing is one in which the President—a popular President—appeals to the people by his very fine-sounding messages; but then come along Ezra Taft Benson, George Humphrey, and Secretary McKay, and they are the ones who get out the apparatus which is wielded by the wrecking crew.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, is it not true that they are the ones who are running the Government? After all, they administer it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, it appears to me that they have the responsibility for administering these programs. However, I want to hold the President accountable for the administration. We do not have a constitutional monarchy. We have a President of the United States, and he is responsible for the administration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have been listening to the very interesting discussion between my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The discussion they have been conducting prompts me to ask a ques-

tion: Is not what we are seeing today an example of what the President calls "dynamic conservatism"? While he is being dynamic, his Cabinet members are being conservative. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the Senator's suggestion, if he will amend it by saying "dynamic in spirit, but conservative in action."

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota, who is so well informed on the farm question, and who has been giving us such an able speech today, that the phrase "dynamic conservatism," which the President likes to use, reminds me of a passage in a book by the late Stephen Leacock, the great Canadian humorist, in which he speaks of someone as "a large, small man." I have always felt that the phrase "dynamic conservatism" both gives and takes away, as does the phrase "a large, small man." I think that indicates the situation of the President, which the Senator from Minnesota is describing today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I am reminded that in the recent campaign many of the Republican spokesmen used to say, "Elect a Republican Congress and help like to finish the job." In that connection, I ask this question: What job, and with whom? The job of cutting out vocational training? The job of reducing assistance to soil-conservation districts? Or the job of reducing price supports? The administration has reduced them to 82½ percent. Are we supposed to finish the job by reducing them to 75 percent?

We can go right down the line in that connection. For instance, we can refer to the National Health Institutes. I know that recently the President conferred a very high honor upon Dr. Salk. That honor was well deserved, and I wish to congratulate the President upon that very timely and worthy presentation. But at the same time, Mr. President, one of the best ways to confer honors upon a great scientist is to back his scientific program. Yet the heart research funds were cut more than 45 percent, and the cancer research funds were cut 35 percent, and the mental health research funds were cut more than 30 percent from the amounts recommended by the Advisory Board, constituted of prominent professional and technical persons. In other words, the recommendations of the Advisory Board were ignored, at least, in part.

The greatest honor which can be given to one who already has made a great contribution to society is not just a citation, but is to give the honor of forwarding and advancing the program to which such able and wonderful men dedicate their lives.

I think the best way that farm families of low income can be helpful today is literally to strengthen and firm up the programs which have been discussed here today, and which were referred to in the President's message.

There is not much need for much new legislation in this field. We already have authorized vocational training and soil conservation and the Farmers' Home Administration. The Farmers' Home Ad-

ministration should have many more millions of dollars for its use. The present administration should devote its efforts to obtaining such funds. The Farmers' Home Administration could have lower rates of interest if the administration would only dedicate its efforts to obtaining such lower interest rates. There are many things that could be done, but they will not be done by having the President, on one day, utter kindly, compassionate words and the next day, or the day after, having the responsible administrative officers in the Cabinet do just the opposite.

So, despite President Eisenhower's message, his own Bureau of the Budget appears opposed to taking an annual look at whether or not our farm programs are accomplishing their objectives in this field.

In conclusion on this subject, let me say that the spirit of the President's avowed intentions is strong, but the flesh of his specific recommendations is weak. The spirit triumphs over almost everything except the problems. It will require the hard substance of legislation, money, credit, and programs to realize these objectives. Farmers cannot survive on good intentions. The President, quite rightly, calls for a many-sided attack on this problem, but he arms us only with pea shooters. It is deceiving to create the impression, when we are squarely faced with an economic problem confronting one-fourth of all the families who live on American farms, that the problem can be solved by so-called pilot operations of counsel and guidance in only 50 counties of the Nation.

I wish my friend from Alabama to know that the President's recommendations covered 50 counties in the Nation. The Senator himself must realize that that is better than five, but it is very, very short of reaching the needs. It is only 10 percent of the 500 counties which the Senator from Alabama recommended. Anyone who looks over this great America of ours, and who proposes to engage in any kind of pilot operation as a basis for a farm program knows that such an operation cannot be successful when it uses only 50 counties in 48 States. Because of the nature of the land, the economic distribution, and the marketing practices, at least the number of counties proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be required, as the Senator has recommended in his very well conceived and well supported bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I remember correctly, there are 3,000 farm counties in the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Approximately that number.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota may have heard the exchange today between the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in which the Senator from Vermont reminded the Senator from Maine that in neither State was there an entire county which could qualify as a low-

income county, but that there were low-income farm areas, nevertheless.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota recognizes that the same situation is true all over the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is indeed the truth.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the low-income areas are not concentrated in any particular section of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota recalls, I am sure, that of the 3,000 counties, it is estimated that 1,000, or one-third of them, would qualify as low-income farm counties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that is the general estimate which has been made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Remembering that 1,000, or one-third of the counties, are reckoned as low-income counties, and that certainly there are many other areas where, perhaps, an entire county would not fall in that category, does the Senator believe it is unreasonable to carry on a pilot study, or a technical assistance program, in 500 counties?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, would that be an expensive program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not be an expensive program, because the machinery is already in existence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may recall that in my bill I proposed that the existing machinery be used to do this particular job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In our Extension Service, our State farm committees, the so-called ASC or former PMA committees—

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; also in the Farmers' Home Administration, the Crop Insurance Administration, and in the land-grant colleges, we have facilities at our fingertips to do the job. All that is required is a sense of direction and a desire to get the job done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Starting with 500 counties, will the Senator agree with me that that would really be inaugurating an attack on the problem, which might offer some hope of success?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whereas 50 counties would amount to little.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator's statement is correct.

The Senator may recall that in the Midwest, in the two Dakotas, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Montana, Colorado, and Wyoming, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association is now employing competent research people and accountants to make agricultural income studies in those States. In other words, a private farmers' cooperative is taking on a bigger job, with its own resources, than the President of the United States proposes for the entire Government of the United States. I think that bears out what the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, that if we are to do the job, we ought to do it in enough areas so that the statisti-

cal information we may obtain and the reports we may ultimately receive will be at least sufficiently embrative in their coverage so that we can actually know what the results of the program have been.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator agree with me that one of the greatest needs of the operator of the small-sized farm, the low-income farm—the farmer we still like to think of as using the farm not only as a place to make a living, but a place to live—is adequate credit?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator agree that the banking system of our country and our banking laws are not designed to afford the farmer that kind of credit?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is absolutely true. It has been recognized by the Government of the United States for 25 years that the existing private banking system is simply not established upon principles and economic standards which permit the kind of loans, at low rates of interest, which would enable farm families in the low-income areas and groups to lift themselves by their own work, after they receive such credit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is aware, I am sure, of the professed desire on the part of the Department of Agriculture to encourage farmers to diversify their farming, and make it flexible, so that they can change from one crop to another?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A part of the theory of the sliding scale supports is that as a crop comes into surplus the farmers will change their type of agriculture and go into the production of another crop. Can the average small farmer make that change?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does he have the flexibility which would make it possible, and can he obtain such flexibility unless he has a more nearly adequate credit system than he now has?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know of no Member of the Senate who is better informed on the subject of fiscal policy and credit policy than is the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He has been chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He has been a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency for many years. He has concentrated on these problems. I think what the Senator has indicated by his questions is obviously the fact. I think the truth of that statement is apparent. A farmer cannot possibly make shifts in production, particularly if he is already in the low-income brackets, without having additional capital resources, which means, for this farmer, the availability of long-term credit at low rates of interest, which he cannot obtain in the private market.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to my friend from Minnesota that I do not consider that this problem necessarily lies exclusively in the field of finance and fiscal management. My experience has come from another angle. All my life I have lived among people who fall

in the category described. In fact, I have been one of them. Today I own a small farm. There are two tenants on it who fall in that category. I know something about their ability to do or not to do what they want to do.

I know something about where the pinch is felt. It is felt by the little farmer, who does not have the means himself and who never hopes to accumulate a great amount of money by farming, but who believes, at least, that it is an occupation in which he and his family can make a living and can rear their children and make good citizens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe we must always look at agriculture as being more than merely an economic function. It is also a social function. As the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, family farms and the family farm pattern are basic to the entire structure of our society. It is the keystone, we might well say, to individual liberty, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech. The individual farmer and the individual small-business man and the independent proprietor are standing on their own. They are the bulwark of traditional liberalism and of traditional freedom in the whole world.

We do not need any experiments. The Department of Agriculture has all the experience and training necessary at its beck and call to undertake a practical action program offering some hope of results. All that it needs is the emphasis and support at the top and willingness to back up with deeds the fine words the President has expressed.

If, as the President says, "We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our million and a half farm families with extremely low incomes—for their own well-being and for the good of our country and all our people," let us really open that door, instead of just letting a crack of light seep through.

Let us open the door, instead of opening it just a little crack and then snapping on the safety lock as soon as someone wants to go through that little crack to see what is beyond the horizon.

That situation should be very evident, and I know it is evident to farm families. It is extremely evident to them.

Farm income continues to go down. Nevertheless, all we get from the administration is a message. Disaster has overtaken area after area in this country, through drought, wind erosion, and blight. Still, all we get is a trip by the Secretary of Agriculture and a rise in interest rates of mortgage loans.

The Government still complains about the problem of surpluses. At the same time it seems to be lost and uncertain as to what it can do about this wonderful abundance which it is our privilege to have.

I hope no one will be misled by the message on low farm income which has been placed before us. I commend the President for his objective. I should like to encourage him now to hold a Cabinet meeting, or at least a departmental meeting, and to have the Secretary of Agriculture make certain that these objectives are pursued.

Then I would like to have the President call in his Director of the Budget

and indicate to him what is contained in the President's message, and direct the Director of the Budget to send a new letter to the Committee on Agriculture in connection with bills now before that committee which are designed to carry out the very objectives to which the President has pledged himself and has generously commented upon and has supported.

The only way to have something done is for the President to be President, and for the President to make decisions, and for the President to recognize the fact that he himself will be held accountable for the farm program.

It is not the Benson program; it is the Eisenhower program. Mr. Benson just works for the Government. He did not get elected. He was appointed. He is carrying out the President's policy. Supposedly, the Bureau of the Budget is carrying out the President's policy. The Bureau of the Budget is a part of the executive department. It is in the President's office. I would remind the President of the United States this afternoon—and I do so most respectfully—that his own Director of the Budget has already sent a message to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which negates a part of the purpose and objective of the President's message; it repudiates the message and cancels it out for all practical purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While we are talking about the small farmers, the Senator from Minnesota may recall that a year or more ago there was considerable discussion about the desirability of a great many of the small farmers leaving the farms. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember some of the comments of the administration which encouraged people to start moving from the farms?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember the speech of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Butz. I believe that speech was made in Washington, D. C. At least a speech like that was made by him in Washington. He said that farming today is big business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I happen to have that quotation before me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Alabama to inform me and the Senate and the Record and the minority leader what the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture had to say.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is a quotation from the Record Stockmen, of Denver, Colo., of March 10, 1955. That was not so long ago.

"Adapt or die, resist and perish," declared Earl Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in Denver in November as he spoke to the National Farm and Ranch Congress on New Frontiers for the West.

"Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else. Farming takes capital and managerial capacity," he added.

Does the Senator from Minnesota subscribe to the philosophy that it is desirable to have agriculture limited to the big business field?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do not. One of the great prides and joys of America is the small family farm. One of the basic problems in the world, I may say to the Senator from Alabama, is the large collective farm and the corporate farm. The difference between American agriculture and Soviet agriculture today is the difference between individual family farm ownership and state collective ownership. Whether it be state collective ownership or corporate ownership, the undertaking still gets too big. It loses its personality. It loses its identity with people.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, if we compare farming with industry, we narrow the base considerably. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not well to recognize the principle that strength—political strength and strength of every other kind—is buttressed by having as broad a base as possible; and is that not what we get when we hold onto the small family-sized farm?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely right. I point out to the Senator again, and for the purpose of the record, that the challenge which was laid down before us by the studies which have been made on agricultural income, namely, that agricultural family income is dropping, that agricultural farm mortgages are increasing, and that the low-income group is beginning to get larger, calls for positive and effective and immediate action, if we are to preserve the kind of economic system which so many commentators talk about, write about, and obviously think about, namely, the free enterprise and private ownership system.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield once more, I shall not impose upon him further. The Senator has made some reference in the course of his remarks to the fact that one part of the administration does not know what the other part is doing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator feels that perhaps some times Secretary Benson does not realize what Secretary Benson is doing or saying. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota is familiar with the speech Secretary Benson made on November 19, 1953, in which he said:

Farm income and buying power has declined (because of) the repeated urgings of our predecessors for all-out production. Year after year, farmers were urged, coaxed, begged, and almost threatened to step up production of feed grains, cotton, meat, and dairy products. The resulting flood of wheat, cotton, corn, and beef now bulges our bins and markets.

In other words, he was speaking against abundance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota knows that on the very next day, November 20, 1953, Secretary Benson said in a speech:

Naturally, then, some people are inclined to look upon such surpluses as a terrible calamity. But I cannot agree. Abundance is one of the greatest blessings in this choice land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to the Senator that there are some advantages in that kind of talk. For those who are against abundance Mr. Benson has a speech, and for those who are in favor of abundance he has a different speech. But does the President know about either speech?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish I could answer the distinguished Senator's question on that point. I do not know. I have noticed the comments of Mr. Merriam Smith, who has been writing all sorts of articles to the effect that the President did not have much time to devote to newspapers and magazines. So it may be that the President did not have an opportunity to read the speeches which Mr. Benson made. Undoubtedly he was not briefed, and probably he was not briefed on the idea of the 66½-percent rise in the interest rate for marginal farmers of the kind he talked about yesterday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator that the President wants the marginal farmers saved, but he wants them saved at good, solid interest-rate levels. He does not want to save them with lower, cheaper interest rates. Let us get them up to good banking standards, according to the traditional Republican idea of how to save someone. Just raise the interest rate. Whenever we see a rise in the interest rate, a rise in the stock market, and a reduction of farm income, we do not need to ask what party is in power. It is the Republican Party. It never fails.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not also true that we do not need to ask which party will be in power the next time the voters have a chance to speak?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are going to have a chance. We will set the record straight so that they can view both sides of the issue.

In this instance the administration has covered several sides of the same issue in each pronouncement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the philosophy advanced by the present administration goes into effect with reference to the small farmers leaving the farms, and too many people trying to farm, where is the farmer going; and what is he going to do when he and his family get there?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, he can become a Republican precinct worker on election day—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am talking about his making a living.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, if the Senator wants the Republican leadership to think about that, we must get another message here. What I think should be stated is that if farmers continue to leave the farm, there is only one place for them to go, and that is to the cities. If they go to the cities, they either have to find industrial employment or become public charges. Surely we do not want the latter to happen. The possibilities of rising industrial employment, in the form of new jobs in terms of our increase in population, becomes ever more difficult.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that the sensible position for any administration to take would be to try to preserve the stability of American agriculture and

to broaden the home-ownership and land-ownership base in this country by supporting a program that makes it possible for a farm family to make a living off the land.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator completely. I am sure we are both in agreement that our criticism of the President's program has not been based on the fact that he has proposed something, but on the fact that it is entirely too little, and also reminding him that it comes rather late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I now wish to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk in recent days on a subject which is close to the hearts of all of us, namely, American foreign policy. I wish to spend a few moments to make one or two observations on what I think is happening. I have read the comments of the distinguished minority leader and other Senators on both sides of the aisle. I do not seek an argument. I should like to state my observations. I lay no claim to having a grasp of the truth. I seek only the truth, and whatever I say I hope all will accept in the spirit of its being nothing more nor less than the expression of one Senator.

None of us has as much information at his fingertips as have those who are responsible for foreign policy in the executive branch of the Government. But the Constitution places a responsibility upon the Senate to advise and consent as to matters which relate to treaties, the appointment of ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary, and other questions relating to the area of defense, foreign policy, and security. It is within that field that I direct my remarks.

Mr. President, some of us have warned time after time on the floor of the Senate that Communist strategy changes from time to time, but its objectives remain the same. I can recall 2 years ago standing right here at this desk and pointing out to my colleagues in the Senate the importance of the meeting in Moscow in September and October 1952, of all the Communist nations and their representatives in the 19th Communist Party Congress. I pointed out then, as did others, that the Soviet Union laid down as its objective dividing the United States from its allies, primarily Great Britain; pursuing a relentless economic war against the United States and its allies; seeking new markets; and emphasizing the Communist strategy of infiltration, subversion, and coercion.

I think I said that day, Mr. President, that the Communists had abandoned the policy of violence and force momentarily and had embraced a policy of a political offensive based upon negotiations, alleged peaceful pursuits, diplomacy, and economic activity. This has come to be. We have seen it in our time.

One of the regrettable aspects of our work in the Senate is that we have no

committee or subcommittee in the Senate of the United States which concentrates upon the study of Communist strategy and tactics. We receive a little bit of information here and a little bit there, a little bit from the State Department, a little bit from the Central Intelligence Agency, a little more from the press, and from visits with informed persons. But no concentrated, coordinated research study of Communist tactics and strategy is made, so that in every instance we are more or less planning, thinking, and speaking from inadequate evidence and inadequate information.

I am confident that the executive branch, through the Central Intelligence Agency, through the National Security Council, through the State Department, through the Department of Defense, and the intelligence services of the Armed Forces, receives a vast amount of information. But the information is important only if it is properly evaluated, and from that evaluation proper conclusions are drawn as a basis for effective policy.

What is the situation as we see it? Ten years ago this week our Government was participating in negotiations in San Francisco for the establishment of the United Nations organization.

Think of what has happened in the 10 years since 1945. Think of the world as it was in 1945. World War II was still raging in Europe and in the Pacific. Our forces were fighting their way back from the Philippines—back to victory. Hitler's armies were still strong in Europe.

Since that time we have been a victor in Europe and in the Pacific. Our forces have occupied Germany and Japan. Both of those nations now have had their sovereignty returned, and both have treaties of friendship. Both nations have been generously treated by the Government and the people of the United States. Never in history has a conqueror treated the conquered so kindly and so generously as the United States of America has treated those who were its former enemies.

We have come through a decade in which it was necessary for us to feed the poor and heal the sick; in which we have had to help those who were impoverished and unfortunate. This was done through UNRRA and interim aid, and then through the Marshall plan, working in cooperation with the nations of Western Europe.

We have witnessed an amazing recovery. Ten years ago Europe was in ashes. Today its production is, on the average, more than 50 percent greater than it was in the best year before World War II.

We have consummated the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and have sent American troops to Europe. I remember the historic decisions which were taken in Congress. I recall participating in the debates and casting my votes for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for troops to Europe, for military assistance, and then for mutual security.

How well I remember President Truman's proposal known as point 4, the technical and scientific assistance program for the underprivileged peoples

and the underdeveloped areas. It was a great and magnificent idea. It has had a great impact, despite the limitations which have been imposed on the program.

We had to fight a war in Korea. Not very many people were happy about that situation. But the objectives and the purpose of that struggle were fulfilled. We stopped Communist aggression. We stopped, at least momentarily, the Communist time table for moving into Southeast Asia. We unified the nations of the Western World. The Soviet Union never made a greater mistake in its history than when it had its satellite, North Korea, attack the Republic of South Korea. It was that attack which alerted the Americans, the British, the French—yes, everyone—to the military menace of the Soviet Union and its satellites. It was that attack which proved beyond a shadow of doubt that the Communist Party is an international conspiracy, dedicated to the overthrow of free men and their institutions.

I said late in 1952 and early in 1953 that I was convinced there would be a truce in Korea, because the Soviet Union realized that the Korean war was not paying dividends for the Communist world.

I have said on the floor, time after time, that the central problem in Europe to which the Soviet Union was directing its attention was Germany. I repeat that here today.

I have said time after time in the Senate that the central area of concern for the United States of America in Asia was not Formosa, but that it should be Southeast Asia—India, Burma, Thailand, Ceylon, Indochina, and Indonesia. I repeat that assertion and statement today. That is the area which is vital to our national security.

Germany is vital to the security of Western Europe.

Mr. President, I think it is crystal clear that at this very hour the Soviet Union is seeking by diplomacy and by all other means at its command to neutralize Germany, so that German manpower will not be integrated into the Western Defense System under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Why do I say that? Because within recent weeks, again, the Soviet Union and Red China have seized the initiative.

I do not wish to be partisan about the matter, but I want to say that although I have heard much about our seizing the initiative, we have not seized it. We have not even seen it. We have, rather, lost it.

Mr. Molotov, in his message to the Chancellor of Austria, inviting Chancellor Raab to go to Moscow and negotiate an Austrian treaty, seized the initiative in Western Europe. The United States of America, France, and Great Britain are now preparing to negotiate a treaty to return to Austria her independence and to make her neutral.

The Soviet Union in many ways was reasonably generous in her terms. Why negotiate such a treaty now? Because once the Paris Accord had been ratified by the German Bundestag, the French Chamber of Deputies, the British House of Commons, and the United States Sen-

ate, restoring sovereignty to the Federal Republic of Germany and bringing West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the next step, the crucial step, will be the rearmament of West Germany, so that German manpower, German divisions, can share in the defense of Western Europe.

This is what the Soviet Union will attempt to stop. This is their prime objective in Europe. Therefore, they are using the device of negotiating a treaty with Austria.

I have great sympathy for the Austrians. Our Government, of course, is bound and committed to negotiate a treaty with Austria. We have long pursued a policy of independence for Austria. We must now join in the negotiations and support the treaty. But I think we should know that what the Soviet Union and Mr. Molotov did was to set a trap, or at least to bait a hook, for the West Germans, because everyone in West Germany who is in public life, and even those in private life, thinks of one thing first—the reunification of West Germany and East Germany. This is a passion with the German people, and it is understandable why it should be. It is the promise of every political leader in every political party, without exception, including Chancellor Adenauer.

It is dangerous to make predictions, but I shall take the risk and predict that before too long, once the treaty with Austria has been consummated and Austrian independence has been restored, and Austria has declared her neutrality, as she must do under the treaty by her commitment to the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union will then proceed to try to negotiate with West Germany and East Germany for the reunification of Germany, and to have Germany be a neutral.

This would be a blow to the foreign policy of the United States and to the safety and security of the free world, because our plans in the Western European area have been built around the proposition and the hope that West German manpower would be integrated with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

There are neutralist parties in Germany. In the recent elections in Germany some of those parties gained strength over Chancellor Adenauer, who has been devoted to the efforts of the West and to the rearmament of West Germany and its participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

So I simply wish to say in a spirit of friendship that I hope the Secretary of State of the United States will be in the closest consultation with our allies in Western Europe, and in particular with the leaders of the West German Federal Republic, to see to it that the aim and objective of the Soviet Union foreign policy is not realized. I should like to say to the Secretary that he can expect, as the newspaper headlines now proclaim day after day, that the Soviet Union will press for negotiation, and negotiation at a high level conference; and we must be prepared to participate. I am not one to say that we should not engage in such negotiations. I am

merely one who says that when we engage in them, we should know why we are there, what we are going to do, what we are not going to do, and what we have for our objective.

As the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the very able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE], has said, the United States of America must be willing to negotiate at any time with any nation about any problem. I think the distinguished Senator from Georgia has done a great service to his country by speaking out so ably and boldly on these many critical and difficult subjects. I praise him, commend him, and thank him as a fellow citizen and as a colleague.

I also say, Mr. President, that in the months to come we can expect the Soviet to coo like a dove. She will have on her Sunday manners, if she believes in Sunday. This has been inherent in everything that has been happening.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of an address which I gave before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Calif., on February 24, and I should like to read something that I said on that occasion which I regard as somewhat pertinent at this time:

There are apparently some who feel that the appointment of Marshal Zhukov as Minister of Defense presents the opportunity for negotiation and easing of the tensions between the United States and the Soviet. This soothing hope is undoubtedly based upon the acquaintance of President Eisenhower with Marshal Zhukov during World War II. For American policy to be based upon this wishful hope would be a serious error. Marshal Zhukov as Minister of Defense is under the immediate control and direction of Khrushchev and the hierarchy of the Communist Party. He will be held strictly accountable and responsible for the fullest cooperation and participation by the Red army in fulfilling the policy and strategy of the Communist Party. Zhukov is undoubtedly a popular hero in Russia, but with Marshal Bulganin as premier, Zhukov will be taking and carrying out orders. If he fails to do so, he will suffer the fate of other Soviet leaders. By the mere fact of his professed respect for President Eisenhower, he is all the more suspect. How easy it would be if Zhukov should get out of line to readily prove, Communist Bolshevik style, that Zhukov was a traitor, puppet of the West.

That is commonly known as liquidation.

Continuing with the speech I made:

There is a good reason to believe that Zhukov will be used on the international propaganda front, first, to arouse fears in Europe of German rearmament, and, secondly, to arouse hopes in America of peaceful coexistence, thereby helping to bring complacency to our shores.

Mr. President, it has happened. Mr. Zhukov is remembered as the great hero of the Red armies of World War II; and a great general he is and was. I want the record clear, as far as the Senate is concerned, despite Mr. Zhukov's personal desire, if he has it, and let us assume for the moment he does have it, of friendly, agreeable relationships because of his admiration and respect for his wartime compatriot in the Armed Forces command, General Eisenhower—despite that desire, let no American be deluded

into believing that Zhukov can like somebody and do something about it and at the same time violate the rules, discipline, and policies of the Communist Party, and still live. It is impossible. So it is apparent that the Soviet wants, for a period of time, in Western Europe, relaxation of the tension. This we want, too. It would seem, on the face of it, we both should be very content.

Why does the Soviet Union want relaxation of tension in Europe? Because if the Soviet acts too belligerently, if there is too much trouble, then Western Germany will rearm. The Germans will become fearful again of Soviet power and will rearm. But if it can look peaceful, if it can look as if Zhukov, Bulganin, Voroshilov, Khrushchev, and the others are taking things easier, and are being more cooperative, then indeed the neutralist spirit in Europe will rise, particularly in Western Germany. The day that Germany is reunited and declares her neutrality, the Soviet Union will become belligerent.

Russia turns off the faucet one day, and on the next day. She is sweetness and light one month, then a vicious dragon the next. We should not be deluded by Communist strategy. We know its objective.

I have said I am confident that the Soviet will recommend negotiations and seem to be prepared to negotiate. Those negotiations may lead to the relaxation of tension. They may lead to the reduction of armaments. That is a possibility, and I do not think too remote a possibility. Then we shall have a certain number of years of what may be called cessation of hostilities, or "peace." I prefer to call it time.

The question about time is what we do with it. Time is meaningless and valueless unless it is used. The importance of time is, Who will use it, and for what purpose?

Supposing that negotiations with the Soviet were reasonably successful; supposing we could reduce some of our armaments and expenditures for defense; I wonder if we here in the Congress would be willing to dedicate the same amount of resources, money, and dedication to the pursuits of peace as we have to the pursuits of defense. In other words, I wonder if we would be willing to utilize the same amount of actual expenditures we have devoted to military uses to economic, social, and political betterment?

I remember well what Senator McMahon said in one of his last speeches: If we could have disarmament, if we could have reduction of arms, what great good would come if we could devote a portion of that effort to cultural, social, and health improvement throughout the world.

I wonder if we are prepared, morally, politically, and in every way to follow through on that kind of a commitment? Because, make no mistake, the Soviet Union has an oriental attitude about time. The people in power think if they can keep on putting enough pressure, using propaganda, using their economic power, using infiltrators and agents, in due time they will pick off one country after another without war.

I want to meet that challenge. I am one who does not want war, either. I think a defense based on nuclear or atomic weapons is just planned suicide. I know certain persons will say we have more weapons than Russia has and that gives us temporary superiority. Yes, it does; but I do not know who would be around to calculate who was superior after a war. I am confident we could survive such a war but no nation will win it. Can anyone tell me that any war promoted liberty, independence, equality, and the kind of society we want?

After World War I, democracy was not stronger; it was weaker. After World War II, communism reached out and took in hundreds of millions of people. If world war III should occur, there would not be a world which could engage in parliamentary discussion of its problems; it would be a world of dictatorial authority and communism or some other ism which would undoubtedly have been strengthened.

Therefore our policy must be dedicated to peace. It must be a policy which is based on strength and knowing what we want, and there must be a consistency of policy. Let us not talk about hydrogen bombs. We are scaring away our friends by that kind of talk. But there should be more talk and more emphasis upon our real resources and the real strength of our country, namely, our faith; our economics; our political system; our land system; our programs of health, education, and welfare; and our love and understanding of people. We should also have a cunning understanding of the tactics and strategy of the enemy.

Mr. President, now let me move to a discussion of the Far East. Some persons have been disturbed because our President—and, Mr. President, he is my President, too, even though I did not vote for him; he is the President of all Americans, and particularly as regards the vital areas of security and defense—the President has said he is prepared to negotiate with Chou En-lai. Again I say that Americans must be prepared to negotiate any time, any place, with anyone who wishes to negotiate; and I think it is an expression of weakness on the part of any citizen of the United States to say that we will "be taken," that we will lose out. That means that we could lose out and could be fooled and could "be taken" if we are not prepared to go to such a negotiation with a strong program and a strong policy and if we do not know what we want. We have had one example of that situation. We went to Geneva, last year. The Geneva Conference will go down as one of the greatest and most colossal diplomatic failures in American history, and I think it is one which will haunt us for years to come. Our representatives went there. The United States invited the Red Chinese to send representatives to Geneva. After our representatives went to the conference, the Secretary of State decided—because of a little political heat, back home—that he should come home; and he decided to leave his assistants in charge at Geneva. Mr. President, one does not win football

games by having the captain go home, particularly when the team is playing Notre Dame or the University of Minnesota; and one does not win diplomatic conferences, when Mr. Molotov and his kind are there, and when there is present Chou En-lai, an able and astute man, as opposition.

Mr. President, I say that once our country had invited the Red Chinese to come to Geneva, our best representatives should have been there, to see that the Red Chinese did not run off with half the world. They ran off with half of Indochina. Mr. President, I am of the opinion—and I express only my own personal opinion in this matter; I have no particular insight into it; I speak only from what I have seen and from what I have read—in my opinion, Chou En-lai, the Red Chinese Foreign Minister and Premier, wants to negotiate because he, too, would like to have a little time—time in which to see whether Southeast Asia may simply fall into his lap. I say that because we Americans have whipped ourselves into a frenzy of thinking that the whole world rises and falls on Formosa. Formosa has been the central point of American thinking and discussion for 4 months. Formosa has 9 million people. Formosa cannot be defended without American defense.

Mr. President, do not misunderstand me; I, too, wish to defend Formosa. But I do not think everything we do must be predicated upon the Island of Formosa. I think we should take Formosa in our stride, and then should proceed with the real business at hand.

Formosa is but a part of the landscape of the world; it is not all the world. Chiang Kai-shek is not the embodiment of all the political leadership in the world—important as he is, and valuable as he is, and ally that he is. I do not say this by way of deprecating either the Formosa area or its leadership. I merely wish to have us put Formosa in proper perspective.

I repeat now what I have said before, in many places in the country, namely, that if tomorrow morning the Soviet Union could choose between Burma and Formosa, the Soviet Union would give many Formosas for one Burma; and if tomorrow the Soviet Union could choose between Japan and Formosa, the Soviet Union would give many Formosas for Japan. Mr. President, Japan is vitally important in the Far East. What is going to happen to Japan? What is our State Department doing about the rising tide of anti-American feeling in Japan? What are our policies toward that nation? During the last 6 months, I have not heard an intelligent presentation of American policy and opinion on Japan. Yet there are 80 million people in Japan, and Japan has the largest industrial-enterprise system in all of Asia, and the fourth largest in the world. Yet we have fixed our minds and our attention entirely upon Formosa. I wish to put Formosa in its proper perspective. Formosa is part of the problem, but not all of it.

Mr. President, at the end of 1952, our relationships with India were good. Chester Bowles was our Ambassador to

India. He had made, as the expression is, "a hit." We were then in closer cooperation with India than we have been either before or since. But since 1952, and to this very hour, our relationships with India have steadily deteriorated, until today India, a nation of over 350 million people, finds itself on many an issue on the opposite side of the table from the United States of America.

This situation should be of great concern to all of us—and of deep diplomatic and political concern, much more concern than the Matsus and Quemoy, a couple of warts in the Pacific, in terms of area. Mr. President, just think of Quemoy and the Matsus, as compared to India. Just think of Quemoy and the Matsus, as compared to Burma, or as compared to Japan.

Mr. President, anyone who would focus his attention on Quemoy and the Matsus, at the expense of these other areas, is one whose sense of judgment is misleading him.

Our relationships with Quemoy and the Matsus are apparently good; but for 9 solid months the United States of America did not even have an Ambassador in Burma, a country with 1,200 miles of common frontier with Red China. Burma is a surplus-rice-producing area, whereas it is not even possible to produce rutabagas on Quemoy and the Matsus. Burma has 18 million people. Burma has rich mineral resources. Burma was our ally in World War II. But the Prime Minister of Burma has told prominent Americans who recently have seen him that during a period of almost a year he did not see any important Americans. Every other weekend, and sometimes even twice a week, some representative of the United States runs from Washington to Taipei. But how many Americans have been going to see Prime Minister U Nu, of Burma? How many representatives of the United States have taken the time to go see what is occurring in India? How much time have our representatives spent in India, as compared to the amount of time our representatives have spent in other areas of the world?

Mr. President, to refer once more to the matter of negotiation, it is my feeling that we should negotiate, and that we will negotiate, with Red China. However, I hope that we shall recognize that before we negotiate with the Red Chinese, we should have a clear understanding with our friends in the Southeast Asia area. We should talk over all of this matter with them, and should obtain their point of view, and should let them be a part, at least indirectly, in these negotiations. Let us not arrange to have only two big powers go there and decide what they will do, despite the wishes of anyone else. I hope our Government will keep all our allies, including the Nationalist Government of China, on Formosa, continuously informed as to anything we may be doing. This is not to say that they should have a veto power, because I do not think they should have. I do not think the Nationalist Government of China should have a veto power. After all, we have pledged our resources; and I want the American people to know that by means of the

Formosa resolution and the treaty with the Nationalist Republic of China, we have pledged the rights and the fortunes and the honor of every living American, as well as those yet unborn.

This was not some little scrap of paper, some little treaty that did not mean anything. It was the pledge of American lives, fortunes, and honor. That ought to be enough to bolster anybody's morale. When I hear that Chiang Kai-shek is going to suffer a drop in morale if he must get off Quemoy and Matsu, I am inclined to think he does not think very much of the 160 million Americans who have pledged everything they have to his defense. If an ally needs that much pumping up, I am not sure that he is a good ally. I do not think he will need that much. I think he realizes the support he has—and he has that support. I want the record to be clear on that point. I think he has been treated a little unfairly and unkindly. I can understand how Chiang Kai-shek must feel. This administration encouraged him to fortify the Tachens, and then came along and said "Get out." We sent in our demolition crews to blow up the fortifications to the north of Formosa.

This administration "unleashed" Chiang Kai-shek, according to the President's message, in 1953, and undoubtedly encouraged him to fortify the Matsus and Quemoy. I predict that the administration will abandon those islands.

No wonder Chiang Kai-shek feels bad. But he should have known that a good deal of the talk of the administration was for local political purposes, at home. There has been far too much of it. Such an effort has been made by the President to appease and make peace with certain elements of the Republican Party that he has had little or no time to make adjustments looking to peace in the world.

Sometimes I think the President should make up his mind as to where he wants peace. I think he can much better tolerate a little fight in the Senate than out in the Formosa Strait. It is less costly to the American people. Sometimes our squabbles and battles here are not too encouraging to the American people, but I am sure every mother and father realizes that there are fewer casualties when we battle here than when we battle out in the Strait of Formosa.

Mr. President, I say that we are going to be negotiating with Chou En-lai, and I hope that when we do so we will recognize that it is only a part of the package which we must carry and deliver. I hope that now we realize that things are in a bad state of affairs to-night in Indochina. I ask on the floor of the Senate tonight, What is this Government's policy toward Indochina, toward South Vietnam? What is its policy toward Premier Diem? The Premier does not know, and neither do I; and I doubt whether anyone else does. We cannot have a policy which flip-flops from one side of the street to the other and expect anything but trouble.

What is this Government's policy toward Indonesia, with its 88 million peo-

ple? It is 1 of the 4 or 5 largest nations in the world in terms of population, and one of the potentially richest nations in the world. Today in Indonesia there is a coalition government, with Communists in the government.

I want to know why we do not hear more before our committees from the Secretary of State and other top officials about Indonesia. I want to know why we are not being informed. I want to know what our policy is toward these areas. What are we doing there? How much technical assistance are we offering? How much economic assistance are we rendering? What kind of information program have we there? What are we doing about the Indonesian labor movement? Two years ago I advised the Senate that the Communist Party was taking over the Indonesian labor movement, and I called upon the Government to strengthen our labor attachés, to give more emphasis to the labor movement, to strengthen our exchange program, to bring young Indonesian leaders to America to train them in democracy, and in the experiences of freedom. We have not done that, Mr. President.

What is our policy toward Burma? I do not refer merely to our military policy. I know that America feels strongly committed to the military defense of these areas; but it is highly likely that there will be no military action. Those countries can fall into the orbit of the Communist world one by one.

I say on the floor of the Senate that 2 years ago those countries were in a much better position. Two years ago Indonesia was a considerably stronger country, and more friendly to the United States. What about Burma, India, and Indochina? I charge here on the floor of the Senate that this administration's foreign policy in Southeast Asia has been a dismal failure.

I further charge that too little attention has been given to it. I further charge that we have had a sort of fixation upon limited objectives, the most recent of which has been Formosa and Quemoy and Matsu.

I further charge that we have not really developed a policy in our relationships with an independent Japan, and I say that those countries are fast slipping away from any friendly contact and friendly association with the United States. I say that the situation has become worse each month during the past 2 years.

What should we do about it, once having made these charges? First, as important as it is to balance the budget, and as important as it is in the minds of some people to reduce the budget, I suggest that the United States look to the areas of the world which may be lost forever, and see whether or not we can find it within our resources and means to be of some help, even if it costs something.

Let us take a look at our adversaries, the Communists. How do we compare with them? First, in the matter of capital, what this world cries for today in every one of the countries I have mentioned is capital, gold, money, currency. The United States has almost a monopoly on the capital of the world. We are

the richest nation on the face of the globe.

What are we going to do with this capital? If the rest of the world becomes a Communist satellite area, our gold standard will not be worth anything. We had better begin to use our gold resources. We had better make up our minds that we are playing for keeps.

So we have the capital. The dictatorship of the proletariat does not have capital. I hope that my free-enterprise business friends will admit that we have a better economic system, a more productive and better balanced system; yet how many times have I heard prominent exponents of free enterprise in American capitalism say, "If this cold war continues much longer we shall go bankrupt."

That is about the finest way I know of to admit to the Soviets that they are better than we are, because, after all, the cold war affects them, too. If we are going to throw in the towel halfway through the fight, they will win by default.

We lead in the field of capital. Capital is more important in the world today than all the hydrogen bombs we can stockpile from now until kingdom come. Capital will build. Hydrogen bombs will destroy. Hydrogen bombs are, at best, a supplemental weapon. We have capital. Let us use it. How shall we use it? We do not need to give it away. Many of these countries want long-term loans at low rates of interest. Why do we not apply the REA principle of 25- and 30-year loans at 2 percent interest?

Why do we not realize that not all the private investment capital will go to those countries we would like to have go there. That is because many of the countries are too unstable, and therefore Government capital will have to be loaned to them. Many of those nations, like India, are not asking for grants; they are asking for loans.

How many Americans know that last summer and fall Indian representatives were in the city of Washington trying to negotiate a loan and to plan a program for building a steel plant in India with a capacity of 1 million tons.

Those representatives did not get anywhere in Washington. I do not know why that was so. I have never had any explanation for it. I do know that their proposal was rejected, or at least it was never accepted.

Those same representatives went back to New Delhi. The Soviet Ambassador contacted them. Today the Indian Government and the Soviet Union have come to a tentative agreement to build a million-ton-capacity steel plant in India, with Soviet technicians doing it, and with Soviet technicians training 300 Indian technicians in Russia to run the plant.

Do Senators know what I believe our Government should have done? Our Government should have done as it does with young men when they are called in the draft. The Government should have gone to one of our big steel companies and said, "Greetings. Try this on for size. We are going to make you a new kind of GI. You are going to go to India, and you will build a steel plant

over there. You will build one of the finest American steel plants in the world, and you will build it in record-breaking time. In addition, you will train young Indian men to run it. We will show what American capitalism and free enterprise and ingenuity can do. Oh, you will get paid for it. Of course, you will not get as much as you would get for selling steel today at high prices, but you will get paid to do it."

Instead, I suppose the Indians did not want to pay as much interest as this administration wants to charge. Mr. President, interest rates are becoming the curse of this administration. Anyway, we did not do it.

Today for the first time the Soviet Union has many technicians in India. Today for the first time in Pakistan the Soviet Union has dozens and perhaps hundreds of technicians. Today the Soviet Union has technical assistance programs in effect in six Asian nations. Today the Soviet Union is stepping up its exchange program, and is taking thousands of students into Russia every year.

Apparently they are rich, and we are so poor that we cannot afford it. Mr. President, apparently they are peasants; they do not take month-long vacations on Miami Beach and at other places, as we do. They do not have the resources we have. Nevertheless, what they do have, they use.

We persist in cutting our exchange program. We persist in higgling and arguing over interest rates. We persist in putting up obstacles. In the meantime we lose golden opportunities.

At the present time we are far ahead of the Soviet Union and any of its satellites in the field of science and technology. Let us use more of our knowledge.

I say that the technical-assistance program is one of the real secret weapons in our possession. Yet we have persisted in trimming the program instead of expanding it.

I wish to say that much of it ought to be done through the United Nations. We are not very popular in some parts of the world. I am a domestic American politician. When I cannot appeal successfully to someone directly when I am running for office, I do not mind having someone else do it for me.

We need people in the State Department who know how to make friends and persuade and convince people. Certainly, we ought to have sense enough to know about it in the Senate, because although we can excuse people in the State Department, it is inexcusable for us not to know about it.

The United Nations technical-assistance program is an effective program. America should contribute much more to the program and should seek to have the program expanded. We should always try to put the Soviet Union on the spot in that connection. We should lead instead of always pulling back. It is only through programs such as that, in which we train farmers and put people on farmland and train young men and women how to run a government that we will ever have any hope of success in the areas we are talking about. Other-

wise, Chou En-lai will not only get what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is worried about, namely, Quemoy and the Matsus, but Chou En-lai will also get Burma and Indochina and Indonesia. Indonesia is so close to him now that it is practically within his reach and he may be able to take it at any time he wants to do so. It may even be—and I pray to God it may never happen—that he may even get India, with her vast resources and manpower and natural resources and timber and minerals and water and land, or at least that it will fall within the economic and political orbits of communism.

If that happens, we will really be singing God Bless America, and we will be singing it for every minute of our lives, because we will be in serious trouble.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that we should go on the offensive and use our capital. I am not asking that we give it away. I say we must take calculated risks in using it and in lending it. That means international development. It means working with the Colombo nations. It means a closer integration with our British allies and with the British Commonwealth nations. It means trying to do in that part of the world what once was done in Western Europe; namely, we must ask them to come forward with their own plans, and we must try to help them. We should have done that with respect to the Bandung Conference.

Mr. President, we did not even send a representative to Bandung. Representative POWELL went there on his own. I wish to compliment Representative POWELL. He did a great job over there, and he brought great credit to his country. He stood up for his Nation. He did not go there with the blessing of the State Department or the White House.

Our Government did not even send a message of greeting to Bandung. The Moscow radio was playing greetings all day long. Thank God for Sir John of Ceylon. Thank God for Mohammed Ali of Pakistan. Thank God for Carlos Romulo of the Philippines. I mention only a few. We were not treated too badly by some other representatives at that conference. The Prime Minister of Burma was complimentary.

Therefore, I say let us use our science and our technology. Let us expand our exchange program and our information program. The Senator from Oklahoma had in his possession comments about the Voice of America program, and its effectiveness. The Voice of America is effective if we in Congress do not wreck it. We need more of it.

I heard General Gruenther, the Supreme Commander in Europe, state before a committee of the Senate that the Soviet Union was spending more money to block our radio broadcasts, which we beam behind the Iron Curtain, than we spend on our whole Voice of America program all over the world.

Just who is it that is supposed to be the poor nation—we or the Soviet Union? I have been led to believe that we have a better system. I am convinced of it. I believe we have more money in the

bank, and I believe we have greater resources, and I believe we are much better off than the Soviet Union.

There is another need in that part of the world, Mr. President. It is food and fiber. The administration has been trying—at least so it says—to dispose of substantial quantities of our so-called surplus production. It has had a bad time with it. It has not done too well. I am not going to be critical of it, because perhaps it has run into great difficulties in that connection.

However, Mr. President, what prevents this Nation from going to the United Nations and saying to all the Nations assembled there:

"We have 400 million bushels of wheat over and above our needs. We have 500 million bushels of corn. We have 5 million bales of cotton. All of that is over and beyond our needs. We do not want to dump these commodities on the world market and thereby destroy normal channels of trade.

"But what we will do is to offer them to the United Nations and let them set up a special commission within the United Nations to study how these commodities can be used to stabilize world markets, to alleviate human suffering, and to provide a reasonable diet for mankind."

The Communists cannot do that, Mr. President. One of the reasons why the Soviet Union has become so apparently tame and peaceful is because her agriculture has failed. It has broken down. Is it not interesting, Mr. President? It is a sad commentary, I may say, that the practical problem which seems to plague this administration is that our farmers are too efficient, too productive; they just do not know what to do with this great burden of food. The problem of the Soviet Union is that they have a collective agricultural system which is not functioning, and they have not enough food for their own people or for anyone else.

Here is a natural asset on our side. What are we doing about it? We are complaining about it. We are persisting in trying to do it alone instead of using international agencies which could well be used for solving the problem.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that we set up an international food and fiber reserve, which some of us have proposed 3 or 4 years in a row.

Mr. President, I also suggest that we take the message of land reform to the world; first, to the Soviet Union. I can imagine how much fun we can have with this. Here are Soviet propagandists going all over the world telling the peasants to divide up the land, take the land away from the big landowners, and give everyone 5 or 10 acres. That is the Soviet line.

We should do two things: We should point out to the natives that that is a good idea, and that the best place for it to start is in the Soviet Union, because the Soviet Union needs land reform more than does any other country on the face of the earth. It has the worst possible land system. We should be literally goading them. We should be shoving it down their throats through the Voice of America, through every conceivable

means of propaganda and information, and saying, "You really ought to see some of our Iowa and Minnesota farms; you ought to see some of the farms in Nebraska, and on the west coast and on the east coast. We would love to have you come over here and see those farms. It is too bad you folks do not have farms such as ours."

We have not anything to lose in their seeing our farms. As a matter of fact, I am sure that if some of the Russian farmers could see our farms they would not want to go home, and it would not take them long to forget all the communism that has been foisted upon them. After all, there are only a few Communists in the Soviet Union. The first victims of communism were the Russians. They are not all Communists; they are only semi-Communists.

So I say, Mr. President, let us be less fearful. We act as though we are afraid. We are afraid that some Russians will come here and destroy our society, or that if Russian editors come in without fingerprinting, something will go wrong. Of what are we afraid? If we know what we are after, if we know what our assets are, if we are willing to lead and not to follow, we have nothing to fear.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that the best things we have are our own history and traditions. I have said to many young people in America that it was my duty as a student to read *Das Kapital* by Karl Marx. I have read some of the writings of Lenin, some of Trotsky's, some of Stalin's. I have read the Communist Manifesto, and I never got a thrill out of reading one line of it. It did not make any goosepimples come on this man. But I wish to say that we can get a thrill when we read the Declaration of Independence, or the Gettysburg Address—"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." If that does not send a few chills up and down our spines, we are just dead and not yet buried.

What do people want more than anything else in this world? They do not want to be told, "If you do not behave, we are going to use atom bombs on you." That has been the line of many petty political leaders. They say, "We will use precision atom bombs on you."

That is not what people want to be hearing. If we have the bombs, we do not need to talk about them. The enemy knows we have them, and so do our friends. We should be talking about equal rights, proclaiming our Declaration of Independence, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which are God-given rights that no Communist can ever take away from us. If we believe this—and we should believe it, because it is our faith—and after we announce it, we should interpret it in terms of health and education, programs of working with free labor and free management, training people how to run industry, run unions, run credit unions, teaching them how to bring water to the dry and thirsty land, how to reclaim the swamps, how to reclaim the soil, and how to plant crops.

Mr. President, I have been told many times that if a man is going to be successful in anything, he should be

what is natural for him to be—to be himself.

We are not being ourselves when we are afraid, and we are not being ourselves when we ape the Communists. We are not being ourselves when we talk as if we are the god of war. We are the children of peace. We have dedicated our resources, energies, and talents since the beginning of this Republic to the good life, to raise the standard of living, to improve the lot of the common folk, to raising a new standard around which men can rally. It is not enough to do it at home; we have got to do it abroad.

I suggest, Mr. President, that while we negotiate—and that is what we are going to do, apparently—and while the Soviets in Red China seek those negotiations, we should constantly keep in mind that what they are after is not a permanent settlement of these problems, but time. Once the time is obtained from an easing of the tensions, time is in any man's hand that takes it. It does not belong to the enemy and it does not belong to us; it belongs to those who preempt it and use it. It belongs to those who preempt it and use it intelligently.

I say it is time to reevaluate our policies. It is time to reemphasize certain aspects of our policies which have been de-emphasized. Time is running out, Mr. President. We can no longer permit Molotov and Chou En-lai to capture the headlines. We can no longer let them believe they are the peacemakers. We can no longer permit people to believe that they are the emancipators when, in fact, they are the oppressors. We should stand up and be what we are, liberators, emancipators, freedom-lovers, and, above all, the creators of things which are good and wholesome, because I am sure our struggle will not be won in a short time.

It is a long pull, and I think we are prepared for it if we but dedicate ourselves to it.

Mr. President, I am about to move that, under the order previously entered into, the Senate stand adjourned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, and if no other Senator desires to speak, I move that, under the order previously entered, the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 2, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 25), 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years, vice George Templar, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by me under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. S. Baxton Bryant, First Methodist Church, Duncanville, Tex., offered the following prayer:

O God of our Pilgrim Fathers, send Thy spirit to be with us today. Sacred to us all are the memories of those who have given their lives in defense of our country's freedom. Make our lives fit subjects to carry on this priceless heritage. Like millions of other Americans we pray for our Congress today. Give to these Thy servants in government a clear insight to Thy will for our country. Help every Member to be faithful to the trust that has been committed to him. Give each Member of this House the faith to believe that Thy will is always best for a world, a nation, a district, or an individual.

Help the people of our land to serve Thee. Save us from making demands upon our Representatives that are selfish and unreasonable. Keep in the mind of this great body that they represent not only their own districts, but the hope of freedom-loving people everywhere.

We thank Thee for our Speaker and for his long, devoted service to his country.

We thank Thee for the wonderful example that the Speakers of both parties have set before the world of how two great leaders of opposing political parties can honor and respect one another in a free country. Give to each of them the wisdom so to lead their parties in giving our country good legislation that we may lead the world in paths of peace and good will may live in the hearts of all people. In Christ's name we make our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years. This bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, in response to a message from

the President of the United States requesting and recommending its passage.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MASON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I want to call attention for the record to the fact that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], prepared a minority report, which I have signed, expressing reasons why the two of us opposed the bill in committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in view of the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, I think I should state that the vote in the committee on both sides was unanimous except two Members. Therefore, this bill comes before the House with the overwhelming approval of the committee. The views of the two Members who could not approve the bill are clearly expressed in the minority report.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 102 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (50 U. S. C., App., sec. 1212 (a)) is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. (a) Subsection (d) of section 102 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (50 U. S. C., App., sec. 1212 (d)) is hereby amended by inserting after 'title' each place it appears 'or would be subject to this title except for the provisions of section 106.'"

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to contracts with the departments and subcontracts only to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor after December 31, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record on the bill just passed, and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may also be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill would continue for 2 years the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, by making that act effective with respect to receipts or accruals attributable to performance under contracts or subcontracts through December 31, 1956. The act expired on December 31, 1954, but, as the Members know, due to the

way in which the renegotiation process works, no problems are caused by extending the act from that date.

It will be recalled that receipts and accruals under defense contracts are not now subject to renegotiation unless they exceed \$500,000 in a year. Also, when the act was extended last year, the Congress wrote in an exemption for standard commercial articles. These two amendments exempted a considerable amount of defense business from renegotiation, and have enabled the Renegotiation Board to concentrate on areas where renegotiation is most needed.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARRIGG] have also introduced bills which would extend the Renegotiation Act 2 years. The President has recommended that the act be extended for an additional 2 years, as provided in the bill before the House today.

Although it has become possible, through better contracting and price redetermination procedures, to eliminate to some extent the uncertainty as to what eventual fair prices to the Government should be, renegotiation is still necessary to insure that the Government is protected against unreasonable prices and gets value received on defense procurement. This is particularly true in the case of electronic and scientific military equipment, where the Defense Department must procure the very latest types of supersonic aircraft and continually make modifications during the production of such aircraft. It is also true in those many areas where there are limited sources of supply for items that are essential to our national defense.

Our defense expenditures still represent more than half of our national budget; and renegotiation is the only means by which, due to the peculiarities of defense procurement, we can guarantee that our Government is getting the maximum return on the dollars spent on defense. The President in his message requesting the 2-year extension which is provided in this bill stated:

I make this recommendation because I believe the welfare of the country requires it.

The committee adopted an amendment to the bill to clarify a situation arising out of a recent Treasury Department ruling which several industries felt would impose an undue burden on them. It will be recalled that, where the receipts and accruals from contracts and subcontracts were subject to renegotiation, the Renegotiation Act of 1951 suspended the application of the profit limitations in the Vinson-Trammell Act and in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The provision suspending the application of these other acts is very clear in those cases where contractors and subcontractors are subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act. However, a problem arose as to those cases which were exempted from renegotiation under section 106 of the Renegotiation Act. The Treasury Department has held that such exempted items were still subject to the profit limitations of the Vinson-Trammell Act and the Merchant Marine Act.